



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07079248 0



ZRE
Henshaw

(Henshaw's
TRE

THE circumstances which led to the following correspondence with the Bishop of the Diocese, are well known to the Episcopalians of Providence. For others, a sufficient explanation is given in the correspondence itself. I cannot, however, permit the publication of these letters, without expressing my deep regret at the necessity of bringing them before the public eye. The many rumors, exaggerated and contradictory, afloat in the community, some of them most unjust to myself, and others equally unjust to the other parties concerned, can only be met and set at rest, by the facts of the case. The letter of the Bishop is published with his own consent.* While it must be evident to all that, the embarrassments connected with the late ordination at Grace Church, arose from an honest misunderstanding as to the part I was expected to take, I trust that, the respected congregation of Grace Church, will acquit me of all intention to manifest the least disrespect to their Pastor and Diocesan. When placed in the unexpected position in which I found myself at the Chancel, necessity alone induced a course, against which all my personal feelings revolted. For my justification, I must refer to the facts disclosed in the correspondence.

J. W. C.

Bristol, R. I., Jan. 14, 1847.

*Since the above date there has been further correspondence, all of which is published.

STATEMENT.

The statement of the examination which follows, has been read by the other examining Presbyter, the Rev. Mr. Horton, and has been pronounced by him correct in every important particular. The reader will also perceive, that the Bishop in his reply states, "I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination."

[LETTER NO. I.]

TUESDAY EVENING, Dec. 22d, 1846.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw,

DEAR SIR,—I returned to my parish last evening, with an oppressive sense of the painful position into which I have been thrown by circumstances beyond my control. My mind has been engrossed with the consideration of the events of Saturday and Sunday, to the exclusion of almost every thing beside. Did I act hastily, obstinately, or without sufficient reason, in refusing to present ——— for Priests orders; and did I wrong both him and my Bishop, in declining, before the numerous congregation assembled in Grace Church, to assist in his ordination by the laying on of hands; or, am I justified in the course which I pursued both at the Examination and Ordination? If the first, then I owe both my Bishop and ——— an humble apology. If the last, then it is due both to you and to myself that the grounds of my justification should be distinctly stated.

I am thankful that, in reviewing again and again all the circumstances, I find no occasion to regret the decision

to which I was brought in the discharge of what appeared at the time a solemn duty. Of that duty, my calm deliberate judgment does not leave me room to doubt.— Were the same contingencies again before me, I should feel compelled to pursue the same course, though they should lead to the same painful results. Be it then my present duty to state the grounds of my justification.

First: I would remind you of the simple facts.

At your request, I attended the examination of candidates both for Priest's, and for Deacon's orders. In reference to the former, I remarked at the commencement, "These Brethren are so well known to us, I suppose their examination for Priest's orders will be chiefly a matter of form." Your reply intimated a desire that the examination should be thorough. As the senior Presbyterian present, I proceeded accordingly; and at the close of a protracted examination, in which both your son and ——— sustained themselves with great credit, I was ready to express my satisfaction, when Bro. Horton addressed to ——— a question, which drew forth a reply which surprised me. I thought it inconsistent with the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone, and was led to ask several questions, the answers to which confirmed my fears. The protracted discussion that ensued, did not change the aspect of the case. ——— insisted on maintaining, that the penitent sinners justification is not complete till his baptism. In answer to the question, (repeated several times during the discussion,) "*Do you hold that a sinner truly repenting and believing, casting himself on the merits of Christ, ready to obey all his commands, and waiting only the opportunity to be baptised, is not justified by faith before God previous to his baptism?*" The answer invariably was, "He is not *fully* justified—his justification is not *complete*." I remarked that, a man is either justified or he is not; that there could be no half way justification, &c.; that the view of ——— would make justification depend, not on faith alone, but on baptism also, which I do not believe is the doctrine either of the Gospel, or of the Church, as she receives the Gospel; that to be partly justified before baptism, and "*fully*," or "*completely*" justified after baptism, is to divide justification into *parts*; is, in fact, to make it progressive, an idea wholly inconsistent with the

doctrine of justification as held by the Church. ——— contended that such views could be held consistently in the Church, for the House of Bishops had recommended Waterland's Treatise in their list of books for candidates for holy orders—to which I replied, that, as some of the Authors in the list held views inconsistent with each other, we could not suppose the church to sanction all of them; and that, for the Church's view of doctrine we must go to her Articles and Homilies, which latter are set forth by the church expressly as "*Explication of Christian doctrine.*" I referred to the "Homily on Salvation" &c., to which ——— replied that, "all this is said of the faith of those who have been baptised," (referring to the first part of the Homily;) of course, meaning to imply that, Baptism is essential to the justification there spoken of. It was admitted on my part that, the promises of the gospel are made only to those who obey the commands of Christ, and that, no man can be assured of his justification, or can claim to be in a justified state, till he is willing to be baptised;—in other words, his willingness to be baptised, is one of the *fruits* and *evidences* of that faith in Christ which alone justifies before God and gives peace to the conscience. But, that it was highly important to distinguish between the reception of Adult Baptism as a *fruit* and *evidence* of a justifying faith, and the identifying of Baptism with justification. But this distinction did not satisfy ———. He still contended that, no man is "fully justified," or, as he sometimes varied the expression, "His justification is not complete," till he is baptised. In answer to my appeal to the testimony of St. Paul on this subject in reference to circumcision, he replied that, "St. Paul was aiming particularly at Jewish views and prejudices," and would not admit his reasoning to apply to the subject matter in discussion; and finally, he contended that, St. Paul himself was not "fully" justified at his conversion, or any period prior to his Baptism by Ananias. I mention these things to remind you that I could not mistake ———'s views on this subject. I had not then been informed that it was intended that I should present ——— for Priest's orders, but I stated distinctly that, such were my own views that, I could not present a man for orders who held ———'s view of the doctrine of justification.

When, subsequently, I learned from you that, it had been arranged that I should present ———, I remarked that it would be impossible; that I believed him to be radically unsound in relation to the doctrine of justification, and that some one must be provided to take my place. The same evening, I saw the Rev. Dr. Crocker, to whom I stated the case. He fully justified my proceeding and did not see how it was possible for me to do otherwise. Bro. Horton I saw the next morning, and demanded of him, as the other examining Presbyterian that, he should state his opinion. He at once concurred with me in relation to the unsoundness of ———'s views of justification. I was thus confirmed in the position I had taken. Nor did the long interview which I had with ——— at your house, on Saturday, lessen at all my conviction of his unsoundness. While the general statement of his views seemed to harmonise better with those which I have considered as evangelical, yet, when questions were proposed which admitted simply of affirmation or negation, precisely the same difficulties were presented as on the preceding evening.

It was evidently the settled conviction of his mind that, a sinner is not justified before God by faith, "fully" and "completely," till Baptism; though he admitted that, where Baptism could not be had, it would not prevent the salvation of the penitent believer. He complained that, I would not allow him the liberty which the Church allowed. I replied that, it would be an infringement of *my* liberty, to insist that I should present for orders one who, I believed, did not receive the Gospel in its fundamental doctrine—that on all points of speculative doctrine—of church order—the ministry, &c. &c., I could tolerate the most exclusive views—that, I did not much care how high a man's churchmanship might be, provided he preached the evangelical doctrines of our faith, &c. &c.—He contended that, the doctrine of justification by faith, as explained by me in contradistinction from that which he received was a mere "*abstract speculation*" &c. And when, to convince him of its importance in the estimation of the Church, I remarked, among other reasons, that, few Bishops of the church would be willing to ordain him—that I supposed Bishops D—— and W—— would—he added, "Yes, and Bishop I——, &c. I mention this

because it shows that ——— was conscious that there was a harmony of views between himself and these Rt. Rev. Fathers on this subject, which could not be said of a large number of the Bishops of the Church, who are generally considered among us, as holding the Gospel in its simplicity. The result of this last interview was as the former. I stated distinctly to ——— that he must make other arrangements—that I could not conscientiously present him; &c. I understand that Dr. Crocker declined also to take part in the Ordination, and that it was determined to send for Bro. Hathaway. To avoid all misunderstanding with respect to myself, I asked you what would be expected of me. Your reply was, "*simply to present the Deacons.*"

Of course, I could not suppose that I would be expected to assist in the laying on of hands in the ordination of ———. If I could not present him for Priest's Orders, of course I could not, as a Presbyterian, assist in conveying Priestly authority.* I supposed that an arrangement for this purpose had been made with Bro. Horton, though I did not see how he could consistently officiate. But this was not my business; and I made no further inquiry. Imagine then my surprise, when, as the service proceeded, I saw no Presbyterian present but Bro. Hathaway. The prayers were read—the sermon preached—still no Presbyterian entered. My anxiety became painful—should I be placed in the unpleasant position of being obliged to decline before so large a congregation, the request of my own Bishop, to assist as a Presbyterian, in the laying on of hands, in the ordination of a friend? Should I thus prevent the ordination when all the preliminary service had been finished? Or could it go on with but one Presbyterian, and thus my Bishop, my friend, and the respected congregation of Grace Church, be spared an interruption so painful? I had yet a hope that Horton, finishing his services at St. Andrew's, would arrive in season. I presented the Deacons—they were ordained—the Priests were presented—but the third Presbyterian came not. In

* I do not mean by this remark, to imply that the imposition of hands by Presbyters, is really necessary to constitute a valid ordination. Perhaps the word "concur," would be more proper in this connection, than "assist." I suppose the *ordaining power* to be wholly in the Bishop, though I am aware there is a difference of opinion on this subject. In the view which I take, therefore, the late ordination at Grace Church, though irregular, is *valid*.

obedience to your call, I changed my position at the Chancel, and stood beside your son. Upon him I felt I could lay my hands. But what shall I say of my feelings, when you signified your desire that I should lay hands on ———? *How could I do it? How could my Bishop expect me to do it, after what had passed?* Would I have compelled ——— to travel so many miles on Saturday evening, to obtain the services of a Presbyter in his presentation for Priest's Orders, if the difficulty was one which I could overlook? Would I have argued the matter at such length, and made such *decided declarations* to ——— and yourself, if, the very next day, I could permit the mere force of circumstances to cause me to do what judgment and conscience forbade? Impossible—Yet what resource? How avoid disgracing a friend, and mortifying my Bishop, by intimating to his whole congregation, that he was about to do what I considered wrong? There remained however but one course. When the time came for final decision, I could not hesitate. You beckoned to me—I declined. Again you signified your desire that I should assist—I again declined. You hesitated—but what could I do? My painful suspense was relieved by your proceeding with the Ordination with the aid of but one Presbyter.

Such, my dear Bishop, are the facts. I remind you of them for my justification. Not having conversed with you since the Ordination, I know not what your feelings are on this subject; but tell me wherein I have erred, if I have incurred your displeasure? With my views of truth and duty, how could I do otherwise? What on this subject did I leave unsaid or undone, that I ought to have said or done?

With regard to ———, I may be unworthy to sit even at his feet; but, receiving another Gospel than that I have received, how could I say to him—"Go and proclaim it."

Very respectfully and sincerely, your Presbyter,

JAMES W. COOKE.

The following communication from the Bishop was received in reply to the above. In justice to him, I insert the whole as it is, without dividing it into parts for the purpose of comment, and therefore must request the reader to peruse my answer in immediate connection with

the letter itself. It will thus be seen, that I have considered in full, every objection which the Bishop has urged. One portion of his letter only, (that which relates to ——'s orthodoxy and explanations) I reserved for distinct consideration, and have since addressed to the Bishop a communication on the subject. In this I have reviewed the examination at length, and have brought to the notice of the Bishop, with much minuteness, the different grounds on which I was obliged to consider —— unsound.

[LETTER NO. II.]

PROVIDENCE, Dec. 28th, 1846.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—Yours of the 22d instant, did not come to hand until a late hour on Christmas Eve, after my return from Johnston, where I had been to preach that evening. I hastily glanced over it before retiring to bed that night, and then laid it aside—and with it endeavored to dismiss the painful subject from my mind,—at least till the services should be over connected with the memory of that joyful event which brought “peace on earth, and good will to men.”

The daily services of the Church since Thursday have occupied a large share of my time and thoughts; and now, for the first time since its reception, I have given your letter a careful perusal, and shall devote a few leisure moments to answer it, so far as you will probably desire or expect me to respond to it.

Of the orthodoxy of ——, it is unnecessary for me to express any opinion further than to say, that, if in my judgment, he denied any doctrine of the faith, and especially, so important a one as that taught in the Eleventh Article of the Church, I could not have advanced him to the Priesthood.

I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination. Still I think, it would have been more accurate, if you had stated that ——, when he declared his belief that the penitent believer is not *fully* or *completely* justified before baptism, added, by way of explaining his meaning; “that is, in a covenanted sense:” or, as he afterwards said to me, he is not so *to be accounted* in the *sight* of *men* and the *Church*, until

he is declared to be so in baptism. He has to me, more than once, disclaimed his belief in the absurd theory of *progressive* justification. So fully convinced was I that the difference between you was not essential, that I advised ——— to ask a private interview, in the entire persuasion that mutual explanations would show that there was really a substantial agreement as to this fundamental doctrine, notwithstanding apparent differences as to terms and phraseology.

The result of that interview surprised and distressed me. I was grieved to learn that after it, you felt no less strongly than before, that you could not conscientiously present ———, and make the declaration required from the presenter. Still I was glad to hear you state, as you did most explicitly, that you would make no opposition to the ordination, and had no desire to throw any obstacle in the way of it; but your only desire was to be relieved from a specific part in it, which you could not conscientiously perform. I made no effort, I used no persuasion to change your purpose in this particular; for I rigidly respect scruples of conscience. Although I had arranged in my own mind that you would present the candidates for the Priesthood, and Mr. Horton those for the Diaconate, I now concluded that it would be best to divide the work, and let you, as you were perfectly willing to do, present Daniel, and Mr. Horton ———; and so with the Deacons, Mr. Croswell to be presented by you, and Mr. Kelly by Mr. H.

But finding that there was a natural desire on the part of ———, to have an older Presbyterian for a presenter—and fearing, moreover, that the unusual division of the duty referred to above, might lead to idle surmises and speculations, ——— proposed to ride down to Warren for Mr. Hathaway, his former rector and friend—whose place was supplied by Mr. Horton. This final arrangement was very agreeable to all concerned. It would relieve you from the only act connected with the ordination which you scrupled to perform and desired to be excused from; it secured the presentment in the ordinary mode—and at the same time a Presbyterian of standing and years as a presenter for each class of candidates. Such was the state of things on Saturday night. Sunday morning came; and, when we met in the Vestry room, it was arranged

that one of the Presbyters should read the Morning Prayer, and the other read the lessons. Here it was, I believe, that you asked what I expected or wished you to do in the Ordination service? And I replied, "to present the Deacons: you will first present the candidates for the Diaconate, and then Mr. Hathaway will present the candidates for the Priesthood." I understood your question as relating only to the *presentment*, as that was the only point upon which your scruples had been expressed in my hearing; and my answer is, of course, to be interpreted accordingly. After what you had said to me, (and, as I am informed, to others) about your having no wish to throw any obstacle in the way of the ordination of ———, it did not enter into my mind that you would be unwilling to express your assent to the solemn act to which I was about to proceed in the way required of "the Priests present;" in the rubric immediately preceding the words used by the Bishop in the imposition of hands. Had I entertained a suspicion of what was to follow, I should certainly have endeavored, at whatever additional sacrifice or inconvenience it might have involved, to procure the attendance of Mr. Eames, Mr. Taft, or some other Presbyter, and thus have relieved you and myself, and all the parties interested, from the distressing and embarrassing occurrences which ensued. No one with whom I have conversed, conjectured that you would hesitate to concur in every part of the service, provided you were not expected to present ——— and *say the words* which the ordinal prescribes in connection with that act. You may judge therefore, of my surprise, my astonishment, my grief, when, after my hands were laid upon the head of ———, and Mr. Hathaway had, as one of the Presbyters present, expressed his assent in the way prescribed by the rubric, I found that you kept aloof— and when I looked at you, and intimated my desire and expectation that you also should unite—the only response I received was a shake of the head—a significant negative, which could not be misunderstood! The shock was great at the moment—and but for a moment. I instantly remembered that there was no canon or rubric of our Church, which made the concurrence of two or more Presbyters *in that mode* necessary to an ordination of a

Priest, and the Lord helping, I proceeded with the solemn office, as if no interruption had occurred.

After retiring from the church, I consoled myself with the hope that the peculiar circumstances which had occurred at the Chancel were unobserved by the congregation; and this hope was confirmed when I heard that ———, the person principally concerned, was not aware of the fact that you declined laying your hand upon his head, until after the afternoon service, when he incidentally learned it in conversation with a friend. But this hope was soon dismissed, when I heard it as having been spoken of with lamentation and regret, by many eyewitnesses and others.

With this brief review of the painful occurrences connected with the ordination of ——— to the Priesthood, and of my impressions and feelings as to your course in relation to it, I might close this communication. But you have put two or three questions to me respecting the matter, to which it seems proper and expedient that I should reply in the same spirit of frankness with which they have been proposed.

First—you say, “*Tell me wherein I have erred, if I have incurred your displeasure?*”

To say that one of my most beloved and respected Presbyters had, in the presence of several of the clergy, and of a large congregation—in the midst of one of the most solemn offices of our religion—significantly, though silently expressed his dissent from, and disapprobation of, an important official act in which I was engaged in God’s house and before His altar—without my being deeply wounded and seriously displeased, would be an affectation of stoicism to which I lay no claim. And I think, my dear Brother, that when you calmly review all the circumstances of the case, and reflect upon the expectations which I indulged of your concurrence, so far as the canons and rubrics required, and the pains taken to relieve you from a duty which I had, in purpose, assigned you—when I found that you could not conscientiously perform it—thus removing, by the presence of a second Presbyterian, your only *specified* difficulty: when you reflect upon all these things, you cannot wonder that I should have felt wounded and displeased, to meet with a public and unequivocal condemnation of my official act, when I was,

with undoubting confidence, expecting your rubrical concurrence. I have never studied any concealment from, or practised any disguise with you. I have been as free in all my communications with you in matters relating to the church, as with any of my Presbyters: nay, on this occasion, I had manifested my fraternal confidence and regard, in selecting you to be an examiner and presenter in an ordination, when my own son was one of the candidates. I think then, that you erred in not reciprocating my confidence, by stating to me the *full extent* of your difficulties and embarrassments with regard to one of the candidates. The examination of the candidates for the Priesthood was concluded on Friday evening—your private interview with —— took place on Saturday morning. Had you then intimated to me that you had other difficulties than the conscientious scruple about presenting; that you could not concur as the rubric requires the priests present to do; I certainly should not have urged Mr. Child, at much inconvenience to himself, to go to Bristol, for the very purpose of enabling you to remain and take part as one of two Presbyters in the service connected with the Ordination. Mr. Eames was providentially disabled, (although he had assured me that he was willing to ride to church and be carried into the Chancel to assist, if I desired it.) Dr. Crocker could not leave his own church,* and Mr. Horton was the only Presbyter, besides yourself, then expected to be present. This was known to me and to the rest of the clergy and candidates here; and I supposed was equally well known to you. Through the kindness of Mr. Child, I might have secured the attendance of Mr. Taft, Mr. Porter, or some other Presbyter, and I should not then have been compelled to proceed with the ordination without the

[* I stated to —— that I had given the history of the examination, and the questions raised, to the Rev. Dr. Crocker—that he agreed with me fully, in my view of justification, and that he, no more than myself, could present —— for Priest's Orders. To this —— replied, "I have no doubt of that." In fact, Dr. Crocker *could* have left his church, had his pulpit been supplied, but if pressed, he would not have been found *willing*. He was present at the examination of Deacons, at the house of the Bishop, on Saturday morning. Mr. —— was there at the time. It would have been easy to have obtained Dr. C.'s opinion, *had it been desired*. In reference to the other brethren named, it remains to be seen whether they would have been willing to present —— after a full exposition of his views.—J. W. C.]

rubrical concurrence of the "Priests present." I must therefore frankly express the opinion, that you erred in not stating to me the full extent of your objections, while there was time and opportunity to prevent the painful and embarrassing exhibition which took place at the Ordination. Until I received your letter, I had supposed that your dissent was unpremeditated, and produced by some sudden impulse at the time. This constituted, in my mind, the best apology for its being so entirely unexpected by myself and others.

Secondly—You ask, "*What did I leave unsaid or undone, that I ought to have said or done?*"

1. This question has been in part replied to, in what has been said in answer to the preceding one. I think you ought, on Friday evening or Saturday morning, to have said to your Bishop, with frankness and candor, "I am not only unwilling to present ———, but I cannot express my approbation of his ordination, by joining in the imposition of hands." If you *felt* this, your Bishop was entitled to know it; and had he known it in time, he might, at his discretion, have ordered another examination, have secured the attendance of another Presbyter, or have postponed the ordination of the individual objected to; and in any of these ways, he might have obviated the embarrassment which ensued.

2. On arriving at the Vestry room on Sunday morning, just before the time for the commencement of service, you found us in waiting—the Bishop, the candidates, and one Presbyter. After your arrival, the number was precisely as it had been the day before. Mr. Hathaway instead of Mr. Horton—the latter having gone to Warren,* to enable the former to present the candidates for the Priest-

[*The absence of Mr. Horton (which, in fact, led to the whole difficulty at the ordination, as otherwise I should have surmised that the Bishop was depending on me to assist in the imposition of hands,) was not contemplated when the Bishop intimated on Saturday that all the arrangements had been completed. *Since my reply to this letter of the Bishop*, (to which the reader is referred for a full answer to all the objections urged,) I have learned the very significant fact that, neither the Bishop nor Mr. Horton himself, knew of any necessity for his absence, till 9 o'clock on Saturday evening. How then was it possible for me to know of it, when I was not informed of it on Sunday morning till after the ordination, though a message had been left for me by Mr. Horton, with ———, that I should preach for him in the afternoon. Had this message been delivered in season, the whole difficulty would have been avoided.—J. W. C.]

hood, according to their desire—or at least, that of one of them. In answer to an inquiry as to what the Presbyters were expected to do, I requested them to divide the Morning Prayer between them, and stated that you were expected to present the candidates for the Diaconate, and Mr. H. those for the Priesthood—and I reminded you of the order in which this should be done according to the rubric. You saw that there were but two Presbyters present; and there was nothing in what I said or did, from which you could infer that I expected any other—which I certainly did not, but expected that these two would do all that was required of their order, in reference to the ordinations then about to take place. If you had, even at that late hour, intimated that you were unwilling to join in the imposition of hands, we could have sent a carriage and had Mr. Eames brought into the church, and thus have prevented the necessity of deviating from the usual custom, by ordaining a Priest without the manifested public concurrence of more than one of the same order. The service, however, proceeded without anything out of the common order, until the very act of imposing hands upon the candidates for the Priesthood—when, the first intimation I had of your unwillingness to do what the rubric requires of the Priest's present, was a sign which announced to me and to the numerous congregation, your disapprobation of the solemn act in which I was then engaged—and that act one of the most awful that a Bishop can perform. This, in any humble judgment, is one of the things which you "ought to have left undone."

It appears to me that, if you deemed it proper to be present under the circumstances, and believed one of the candidates to be heretical—or the supporter and advocate of "another Gospel" than that of salvation by grace through faith in the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ—the candid and most becoming course would have been, to have publicly stated your objection in answer to the solemn call made by the Bishop upon all present—"if any of them knew of any impediment, &c., to come forth in the name of God and show what it is." Then, no room would have been left for the indulging of vague or idle suspicions of some fearful heresy—or, perhaps, moral crime in the candidate, for which he ought to be exclu-

ded from the office to which the Bishop was in the very act of admitting him. Then the candidate would have had the opportunity of vindicating himself, or of so exposing his fault, that the ordination might be suspended. Having made no response to the appeal made for objections, if any existed, your silence was a tacit approbation, and I think would be universally so considered. After this proper time for objecting had passed, in my humble judgment, there would have been no inconsistency if you had further manifested your concurrence in the usual way.

I have thus, in compliance with your request, with entire candor, answered the questions you proposed to me, and stated my views and feelings in relation to the unpleasant occurrence referred to. It is the first painful thing which has taken place in connexion with my official duties in the Diocese. I pray God that it may be the last. I trust it will produce no agitation amongst our clergy or people, and that our peace and unity may remain undisturbed. Let us strive and pray for our continuance and advancement in Christian harmony and holiness.

However much I may think you have erred in this matter, I do not at all question that you conscientiously believed yourself to be right. I cherish nothing like a feeling of resentment; but shall still, no less cordially than ever, be willing to co-operate with you and all our fellow ministers, in every effort to promote the salvation of souls, the good of the church, and the glory of God.

Very faithfully and truly,

Your affectionate Diocesan,

J. P. K. HENSHAW.

For the information of those not perfectly familiar with the usages of the Church on occasions of Ordination, it may be well to state that, the concurrence of *two* Presbyters when a Deacon is admitted to the order of the Priesthood, by the imposition of hands with the Bishop on the head of the candidate, is deemed sufficient. The *rubric*, indeed, does not say that the Ordination shall not take place without the concurrence of two or more Presbyters; but it manifestly implies it. Its language is, "the

Bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their hands," &c. The plural number being used, it has ever been the custom to require the presence of two Presbyters on such occasions. But I am not aware that the rubric has ever been construed practically so as to be regarded as compulsory on all the Priests present. Sometimes the number is too large; sometimes it is inconvenient; sometimes there are conscientious scruples which prevent compliance. If, in any case, two Presbyters assist, the neglect of a third, would be no obstacle in the way of the ordination. As therefore, arrangements had been made for the attendance of a *third* Presbyter on this occasion, my neglect to join in the imposition of hands, would be no obstacle in the way. I consented to be present for the sole purpose of obliging the Bishop in presenting the Deacons. *This arrangement, securing the attendance of a third Presbyter, was afterwards changed without my knowledge, and hence the whole difficulty.* For further particulars on this point, the reader is referred to the note on page 14.

[LETTER NO. III.]

BRISTOL, Wednesday Evening, Dec. 30th, 1846.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw, D. D.

Dear Sir:—Yours of 28th instant was received this afternoon. Having carefully weighed its contents, I make it my first duty this evening, to reply.

I thank you, my dear Bishop, for the frankness evinced in your statements. I hope you will excuse me, if, with the same frankness, I proceed to show wherein I think that, the objections which you urge to the course I pursued at the Ordination, lose their force.

Objection 1. You imply that my declaration that I "would make no opposition to the ordination, and had no desire to throw any obstacle in the way," is inconsistent with my refusal to join with you in the "imposition of hands."

I cannot acknowledge the justness of the inference. When, immediately after the examination on Friday evening, —— said to you, "Bishop what is to be done ; am I to be ordained or not?" I said, "Do not misunderstand me, Bro. —— ; I do not protest against your ordination. If the Bishop sees fit to ordain you, I shall not object ; but *I* cannot sanction it." At the private interview on Saturday, when I repeated my conviction of his unsoundness, I made use of the emphatic expression, "I could cut off my hand as soon as present you," or something to that effect ; —— replied, "I think, then, you are bound to protest against my ordination." I said, "No, Brother, if you can find a Presbyterian to present you, and the Bishop sees fit to ordain you, I shall not *object*, but *I* cannot be responsible for it."

Now I see no inconsistency between these and similar declarations, and my refusal to join in the imposition of hands. I fulfilled my promise not to protest against the ordination, nor to throw any obstacle in the way. I left my Bishop, and my friend, free to act for themselves, without interference on my part.

But you say, "After what you had said to me (and, as I am informed, to others,) about your having no wish to throw any obstacle in the way of the ordination of ——, it did not enter my mind that you would be unwilling to express your assent to the solemn act to which I was about to proceed," &c.

To me, however, it seems very evident that, *refraining from opposition*, and expressing *positive assent*, are things so different that, the inference is not logical or just. Because a man does not say *no*, it does not follow that he is obliged to say *yes*. I was not the keeper of the conscience of my Bishop, or of the presenting Presbyterian ; I interposed not to prevent their doing what they felt at liberty to do ; but when I was required to perform a positive act of *assent* to that which I could not approve, the case was entirely changed. I could only decline.

Objection 2. You object that my "only desire was to be relieved from a specific part" in the ordination.

If, my dear Bishop, this is your own *inference* from what I said, I do not object to the phrase. But if you mean to say (which I do not suppose,) that I used the

expression, "my *only* desire is to be relieved from this specific part," I do object, for it might imply that I was willing to join in any other part of the Ordination Service. The truth is, my desire to be relieved from this "specific part," was expressed because this "specific part" had been assigned me. If any other had been assigned, involving necessarily my *approbation* of the ordination, it would have been as promptly declined. When, as I supposed everything had been arranged—Brother Hathaway being sent for, who, with Brother Horton would make the number of *two Presbyters beside myself*, and thus obviate any *necessity* of my taking an active part in the Ordination Service; still, to avoid all misunderstanding, I said to you on *Saturday afternoon*, as I parted from you, "Bishop, what will be expected of *me*?" You replied, "simply to present the Deacons;" [it was this question and answer to which I referred in my first communication, and *not* to the conversation in the Vestry Room on Sunday morning;] with this I was satisfied.

But you proceed to say, "No one with whom I have conversed, conjectured that you would hesitate to concur in every part of the service, provided you were not expected to present ———, and *say the words* which the ordinal prescribes." By the underscoring, it would seem that you lay special emphasis upon my objection to "*saying the words*." I do not remember that the "*words*" prescribed in the ordinal to be used by the presenting Presbyter, were made the subject of special remark between *us*. They were in the *private* interview with ———. When he pressed me on the subject, I declared to him frankly, (referring to the "*words*") that I could not say them in the fear of God. But even if I had laid stress on the "*words*" in my conversation with you, my "*scruples*" were based on *general principles fully expressed*, which would necessarily prevent any direct agency in promoting the ordination. An *action* may speak as strongly as *words*. The "*words*" embodied a declaration to which I could not assent; and I should have been singularly inconsistent, if I could be willing to perform an *act* involving, substantially, the same declaration before God and the congregation.

Objection 3. You object that I "erred in not stating to me the full extent of your objections while there was

time and opportunity to prevent the painful and embarrassing exhibition which took place at the ordination."

I do not know, my dear Bishop, how my objections could have embraced a much wider range. If, to affirm my belief that a Brother is radically unsound in the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith; if, to say that, if I know anything of the gospel, the error which he holds is vital; if, to declare that the doctrine which St. Paul taught and which the Church teaches, is not that which this Brother receives; if, to state most distinctly that, error on this subject, I regard as the fruitful source of the principal errors abroad in the Church; if, to assert that I could never present a man for orders who held such views; if, to say all these things in so many words, in your hearing, and to repeat one of the most emphatic of these declarations in the presence of yourself and Mrs. ———, be not to make known the *full extent* of my objections, and to evince "frankness and candor," then I do not know the meaning of language.

The only charge to which I plead guilty is, that I did not state, in so many words, that these objections would apply to the "imposition of hands," as well as to the "presentation." Had I supposed that you thought otherwise, I should not have left you in doubt. When, therefore, you say again, "I think you ought, on Friday evening or Saturday morning, to have said to your Bishop with frankness and candor, 'I am not only unwilling to present ———, but I cannot express my approbation of his ordination by joining in the imposition of hands,'" I cannot plead guilty to the charge of being wanting in "frankness and candor." [I would remark in passing, that in these words you admit that joining in the "imposition of hands" is distinctly an "expressed approbation" of the ordination. When I had so unequivocally declared that I did not and could *not approve* of the ordination, how could my Bishop expect me to "express approbation?"]

Objection 4. You object in substance that, as no provision was made for the attendance of a third Presbyter, I ought to have known that dependence was placed upon myself.

My answer is, that *I did suppose provision had been made for the attendance of a third Presbyter*. Had I not so thought, it would have been evident to me that you labored under a wrong impression with regard to my assisting in the ordination. I should then have undeceived you. But I supposed that Br. Hathaway would constitute the third Presbyter. I had no idea that Horton would be sent to take his place. When, sometime before, I had suggested an arrangement which would take Horton away, you remarked, "that cannot be, for Horton must be present." I felt therefore perfectly at ease. I supposed that Bro. Hathaway, (making the third Presbyter,) would present the Priests—I would present the Deacons—the congregation would know nothing of my objection to ———; there would be no difficulty. This is the true state of the case and explains all.

Objection 5. You object that I did not make known my difficulty at the Vestry Room, before entering the Church; that I "saw there were but two Presbyters present," &c.

I reply that *I did not see that but two Presbyters were present*. In the few moments of time that remained after I entered the Vestry Room, I was occupied in receiving your directions respecting the reading of Morning Prayer, the presenting of the Deacons, and robing, in season to enter the Church with the rest. It was not till I had taken my seat, *while Br. Hathaway was reading the first lesson*, that I observed that but two Presbyters were present. You say that "Mr. Hathaway was there *instead* of Horton." This I did not know. I could not know it. I had not such a *thought*. There was no reason that I should.*

Objection 6. You object that "the candid and most becoming course would have been to have publicly stated your objection in answer to the solemn call upon all present, 'if they knew of any impediment, to come forth in the name of God and show what it is.'"

I can readily conceive, my dear Bishop, that this objection might arise in the minds of the congregation pre-

*See note on page 14.

sent, but I am at a loss to see how it can be seriously urged by yourself. But as you do urge it, I proceed to reply.

1st. I had pledged myself *not* to protest against the ordination, nor to throw any obstacle in the way. By doing as you suggest, I should have broken this pledge. Instead of simply declining to sanction the ordination, which only I did by refusing to join in the imposition of hands, I should have *opposed* and *interposed*, contrary to my promise.

2d. I think I should thus have violated the good order of the Church ; have done that *intentionally* which was most disrespectful to yourself, and have needlessly occasioned great disturbance and excitement in time of public worship. [I do not mean by this, to express an opinion of the course pursued by the Rev. Drs. Smith and Anthon in the case of Cary—that was a case extreme and peculiar—it was *sui generis*.]

3d. I should not have been justified in this course by the *rubric* of the Church. I can think of no case, (if such an extreme case as that of Cary be not one) when a *Presbyter* who has attended the *examination* of a candidate, and expressed *his disapprobation to the Bishop*, would be justified in openly objecting in the Church at the time of ordination. My reasons are briefly these.

1st. The "Appeal" is made, not to the Clergy, but to the *people*. The Bishop first addresses the presenting *Presbyter*;—"Take heed that the person whom ye present unto us be apt and meet for his learning and godly conversation, to exercise his ministry duly, to the honor of God and the edifying of his church."

The Priest answers; "I have enquired concerning him and also examined him, and think him so to be."

The rubric says; "*Then the Bishop shall say unto the people; "Good People," &c.* "After due examination we find not," &c. "But yet if there be any of *you* who knoweth any impediment," &c. let him come forth in the name of God and shew what the crime or impediment is."

Thus, according to the *rubric* and the *words*, it is evident that the appeal is not to the Clergy, but to the *people*. It is to be supposed that if the Clergy have aught against a candidate, they will make known their objec-

tion to the Bishop before the time of ordination. But there may be among the people present, some who know of a "crime" or "impediment," of which the Bishop and clergy are ignorant, and if they do not declare it now, it will be too late. Another reason for this rubric probably is that, the people may have no cause to complain, if an improper person is ordained, as they might have prevented it, if they had seen fit. *Nicholls* says ; " In the first institution of the Deacon's order, the brethren were to vouch for the good character of the persons who were to undertake that office ; "*Brethren*, look out among you seven men of honest report ;" Acts vi. 3. And afterwards it continued a practice in the Church that, when any Deacon, or especially any of the superior orders of Priest or Bishop, were nominated and notified to the *people*, they in testimony of his abilities and good behaviour, were used to cry out, "*he is worthy.*" From this usage the Greek and Latin Churches have inserted into their Liturgies, forms for the *people* to declare the worthiness of the person to be ordained." Bishop Beveridge says : " if any of the *people* know any impediment," &c. [See these and other authorities cited in Bishop Brownell's Commentary on the Prayer Book.] Undoubtedly, if a minister happens to be present, and knows of an "impediment" which he has had no opportunity of communicating to the Bishop, he would be justified in stating his objections publicly in answer to the "Appeal."

2d. This "Appeal" is made on the supposition that *the Bishop is ignorant of the "crime" or "impediment."* He declares unto the "good people" in relation to the candidate, "*After due examination we find not to the contrary,*" &c. "But yet, if there be any of *you* that knoweth," &c. Here the Bishop calls upon the people to tell him that *which he does not know*. If an impediment exists, he wishes to be *informed* of it. If, then, it be conceded, that ministers are included in this Appeal, they would not be at liberty to respond to it, unless they had reason to believe the Bishop to be *ignorant* of the "impediment." Much more, then, an *examining Presbyter, who has made known his objections to the Bishop in private, would not be justified in repeating the same objections in public*. The Bishop is not ignorant. He needs not to be informed. He has already acted as judge

in the case. He has pronounced his decision. In this very "Appeal," knowing these very objections, he declares, "*after due examination, we find not to the contrary,*" &c. To what purpose, then, shall the examining Presbyter respond to this "Appeal?" What has he to *inform* the Bishop of, except of the Bishop's own doings in the case?

But you say, "then the candidate would have had the opportunity of vindicating himself, or of so exposing his fault, that the ordination might be suspended."

The *rubric* says, the ordination shall be suspended "*till such time as the party accused shall be found clear of that crime*" (or "impediment.") But the Bishop has already pronounced the candidate to be "clear" of the alledged "impediment." The ordination therefore, would not, be "suspended" in such a case. The Bishop need only say, "This impediment has been considered, and I deem it insufficient—after due examination I find not to the contrary," &c. "If you have any new matter to produce, I will consider it; if not, the ordination must proceed." And who can doubt that in such a case the ordination would proceed?

But can it be, my dear Bishop that, you really prefer this course, to that which I adopted only as the result of necessity? What a scene would then have been presented in the Church of God? The solemn service not only interrupted, but succeeded by an earnest discussion respecting the orthodoxy of the candidate; the latter, "vindicating himself;" the Bishop, perhaps justifying him; and the Presbyter contending against the Bishop and the candidate; before the respected congregation, of which the former is Rector?

I cannot think that this course would have been "the most candid and becoming" on my part; the most respectful to yourself; or, the most just to the candidate.

Objection 7. You remark that, "having made no response to the "Appeal" made for objections, if any existed, your *silence* was a tacit approbation, and I think would be universally so considered. After this proper time for objecting had passed, in my humble judgment, there would have been no inconsistency if you had further manifested your concurrence in the usual way."

The explanation given above, applies also to this objection. That my "silence" would be considered a "tacit approbation" by those who did not know what had passed, is very natural. *But, before the Bishop, I had not been "silent."* Could it be then, that *he* would interpret my "silence" at the ordination into a "tacit approbation?" Could he suppose that, I thus retracted my solemn declarations to him of my belief in ———'s unsoundness? If he thought so, would it not have been kind in him to have said: "In view of these declarations, you cannot consistently be present in the church?"

But, even admitting this objection to have force, there is yet another fact which should relieve me from any supposed inconsistency in giving apparently this "tacit approbation," and then declining to join in the "imposition of hands." I honestly thought that Bro. Horton would yet come in and relieve my anxiety, and save both my Bishop and myself from the unpleasant consequences that followed. The contingency was continually before me; Will Bro. Horton finish the services at St. Andrew's in season, or has he determined not to be present? *I did not yield the expectation of his presence till the very last moment.*

Objection 8. On a careful re-examination of your letter, I do not find that I have omitted any of your objections to my course at the ordination, unless I am to consider in the light of an "objection," your remarks respecting the *manner* of my declining by a "significant shake of the head," &c.

As I would not willingly behave in a disrespectful manner to any Bishop of the Church, especially my own Diocesan, who has honored me in many ways, and shown me personal kindness, I would ask, with all deference, in *what way*, (if I *must* refuse, which was, and is now, the settled conviction of my mind I was bound to do,) could I decline at that time with more delicacy—with less observation, and with less interruption, than in the manner which I adopted?

From your statement it appears that, you took notice that I "*kept aloof.*" This occasioned you surprise, astonishment, and grief."

I confess, my dear Bishop, that I designed you should take notice that I "*kept aloof*," and that, seeing this, it would not be necessary for me to give a more "significant negative." But when, notwithstanding you "intimated the desire and expectation that I also should unite," what could I do but decline? And in what *manner* could I decline with less observation by the congregation, and pain to you, than by the "silent negative" which I gave?

You repeated your "desire" again, and this compelled me to give another "silent negative." This repetition, I suppose, attracted the notice of the congregation. Had you taken my "*keeping aloof*," to signify what I intended, that it was my *settled determination* not to unite, I suppose attention would not have been so drawn to the fact. But, as I declined, not from "impulse," but from *principle*, no repetition of your desire could alter my purpose.

And now, my dear Bishop, I confess that I should deem myself highly culpable if, willingly, I had placed you in the unpleasant situation into which you were thrown by circumstances which I could not control, without a compromise of conscience. For yourself personally—for Bro. ——— personally—I deeply regret the occurrence. But as I look back upon the occasion—upon the principles involved—the necessity laid upon me, and the account I have to render to our common Lord—I cannot for myself regret the act which has so grieved my Bishop, so wounded the feelings of my friend, and which, you say, has been "spoken of with lamentation and regret by many eye-witnesses and others." Were the same contingencies again before me, I should indeed leave nothing unsaid that could possibly impress you with my determination to do nothing, whether by "presenting," or by "imposition of hands," to sanction the ordination; but if placed again unexpectedly in the same painful position before my Bishop and my Brethren at the Chancel, I must again do the same thing.

One part of your letter I have not noticed. I have purposely reserved it for distinct consideration. I allude to your opinion of ———'s orthodoxy, and your brief remarks respecting his explanations. I will take another occasion to review the questions and cross questions, answers, &c., which leave no doubt in my mind of his un-

soundness. I took so much pains to ascertain his views of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, that, I am confident, if he understands the Gospel aright, I do not. The examination is before my mind with great vividness, and I have had but one opinion on the subject.

This was commenced on the same day on which I received yours—but my stated Lecture on Thursday evening; the extra service for the Festival of the Circumcision on Friday morning; and the completion of preparation for the duties of Sunday, (yesterday;) have not permitted me to close this communication till to-day.

In conclusion, I will express the hope that, the views I have presented may materially modify in your mind, the objections you have so frankly stated. One portion of your letter has deeply increased the painful regret which I cannot but feel at the unhappiness I have caused you. Your kind allusions to me as “one of your most beloved and respected Presbyters”—your remarks upon the special pains taken to secure my presence on this interesting occasion—the expression of your “confidence and regard manifested in selecting you (me) as an Examiner and Presenter in an ordination in which my (your) own son was one of the candidates”—and your feeling allusion to the solemn circumstances under which the Presbyterian thus honored gave a “public and unequivocal condemnation of your official act”—all this, my dear Bishop, I feel deeply. I needed not this appeal to make me sensible both of the delicacy and the painfulness of my position. I would humbly join you in the prayer that, “as this is the first painful thing which has taken place in connection with your official duties in this Diocese, so it may be the last.” And, (understanding, of course, that *principle* should never be compromised) I heartily join in the fervent desire that peace and unity may prevail among us, and that we may continually “advance in Christian harmony and holiness.”

Very respectfully and sincerely, your Presbyterian,
JAS. W. COOKE.

The above was delivered after the Convocation on the week following. It was retained that it might be first seen by the Rev. Mr. Horton. I returned to my parish on Saturday; and on Monday wrote to the Bishop as follows:

Bristol, January 11th, 1847.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw, D. D.

Dear Sir :—Having considered in full, in my last communication, the several objections which you urge against the course I pursued at the ordination, I proceed to notice the only part of your reply of the 28th ult., which I have omitted. I reserved this for distinct remark, in order that it may be viewed on its own merits, and not be blended with the personal considerations involved in the unpleasant circumstances that occurred at the ordination. I allude to your statement of the soundness of ——— with respect to the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Your very brief remarks upon this point relate either to your own private opinion, or to the “explanation” of ———. With respect to the first you state; “Of the orthodoxy of ———, it is unnecessary for me to express any opinion farther than to say, that, if in my judgment, he denied any doctrine of the faith, and especially so important a one as that taught in the Eleventh Article of the Church, I could not have advanced him to the Priesthood.”

Here, my dear Bishop, permit me to say with frankness, that I am met in the outset by a difficulty of a delicate and personal nature. Of course, you believe ——— to be sound in the faith. You assert it—I cannot for a moment doubt it. But is it not evident that in every such case the same declaration may be made by the Bishop? And yet, are there not ministers in the Church who hold, what we would call erroneous doctrines? I would respectfully ask, how they gained entrance into the Ministry? Were they not ordained by Bishops who believed them sound? Even in the case of Cary, it was maintained by the Bishop and his friends, that the young man was sound in the faith. I am met then with this difficulty. You declare your belief that ——— is sound in doctrine. I solemnly affirm my belief that he is unsound. We are thus at issue on a point involving very delicate considerations. If, without any misunderstanding as to the terms used, we make these declarations, then we differ in our views of what constitutes sound doctrine. This difficulty I felt very sensibly at the exami-

nation when, on objecting to ——'s declaration that the sinner is not completely justified before baptism, you interposed with the remark, "neither do I consider justification complete before baptism." I was confounded. It seemed for the moment, either that, I must remain silent, or appear to question the orthodoxy of my Bishop. But feeling I had a duty to perform as examining Presbyter, from which I could not shrink, I replied, "Bishop, I cannot help it—If my own Bishop even holds this opinion, it cannot change my deliberately formed opinions of the doctrines of the Gospel and of the Church. I may be wrong, but I must act according to my views of truth and duty." I added, in substance, that "the more I study the Scriptures and the standards of the Church, the more confirmed I am in the belief that, no external act has anything to do with the sinner's *justification before God*; but that the sinner's obedience with respect to sacraments as well as duties, is simply the fruit of the faith which justifies before God."

I confess, too, in the same spirit of frankness that, the reasoning and illustrations used in the argument that followed, surprised me. Some of these seemed to me, to lead logically, to conclusions which I could not suppose would be assented to by my Bishop. As I remarked to ——, at the private interview on Saturday, when he insisted that you agreed with him, "far be it from me to catechise my Bishop. It would be presumption in me to discuss that point at all—with that I can have nothing to do;" so now, I repeat most respectfully that, if in the statements which follow, I seem to be placed in an antagonistic position with my Bishop on points of doctrine, it is owing to the force of circumstances, and not to any choice or consent of mine.

I now proceed to remind you of various questions, answers, statements, and illustrations, developed in the course of the examination. To these I appeal for proof that I had sufficient reason to declare —— to be unsound on the doctrine of Justification by Faith, as set forth in the Eleventh Article of our Church.

1. The subject of discussion was, the Eleventh Article of the Church. This speaks of justification, or being "accounted righteous before God." It stands by itself. It is not connected with baptism, or anything external.

It speaks not of what is necessary in order to be justified "in the sight of men," or "of the Church," but simply, and only, of justification "*before God.*"

2. Bro. ——— declared expressly, when speaking of his view of the "sinner's justification," that "it is not complete till he is baptized." This, I believe, is contrary to the Eleventh Article of the Church, and plainly contradicts the teaching of St. Paul on this subject. It is also at variance with the "Homily of Justification," to which reference is made in the Eleventh Article.

3. When asked in these words, (repeated in substance several times in the course of the examination,) "Do you hold that a sinner truly repenting and believing, casting himself on the merits of Christ, ready to obey all his commands, and waiting only the opportunity to be baptized, is not justified by faith before God, previous to his baptism?" He replied in every instance, "not fully," or "not completely."

4. To avoid all misunderstanding, Brother Horton said to ———, "Perhaps you do not understand by 'justification' the same thing as Mr. Cooke;" whereupon, I stated that there is but one kind of justification of which the Church speaks as such—that by it I meant, "being accounted righteous in the sight of God;" and yet, after this definition of justification, he gave the same answer to my questions as before, namely, that, in the sight of God, the sinner is "*not completely* justified before baptism."

5. I mention another fact to show that, it was impossible to misunderstand ——— on this subject. More than once, in the course of the examination, you answered, as it were, for ———; and after stating the doctrine in general terms, appealed to him to say, whether this was not his view; to which he assented. On one of these occasions, I said; "Bishop, I do not approve of covering up these things;" you replied, with evident feeling, "Neither do I approve of covering up—I have no such desire." It at once occurred to me that the remark might have wounded your feelings, and on this account, I was sorry for it. But I proceeded immediately to put to ——— the same simple question so easily answered yes, or no; "Do you believe that in the sight of God the truly

penitent sinner is justified before baptism?" He answered, "Not fully."

6. When, by some remarks of yours, it was implied that the differences generally existing on this subject are owing rather to the use of terms than to any important difference respecting the vitals of Christianity, I demurred. I ventured the assertion that error on this very subject of justification, was the fruitful source of the principal errors abroad in the Church. Among other things, I reminded you of the case of ———, and of your opinion expressed at that time, that the difference between him and myself was not essential, whereas in my own opinion, and in the opinion of many of my Brethren, it was a difference affecting the vitals of Christianity. I appealed to his course since that time for proof that I was right; to which you replied, "I cannot be held responsible for the opinions of individuals." Very true, my dear Bishop, but the *fact* justified my dissent from your opinion at the time that the difference between us was only trivial.

7. Again, I admitted that baptism is necessary to those who have opportunity to receive it—that the promises of the gospel are made to the baptized—that this sacrament signs, seals, assures, and confirms to us, the blessings of the gospel—that it is not, (as you intimated my view would make it) a "mere sign and badge," but that, to all "*who worthily receive the same*," it is "*a means of grace*," and a "pledge to assure us thereof." But that, to make baptism necessary to a complete justification before God, is to assign it an office which neither the Gospel, nor the Church, assigns it.

8. It was argued by ——— that such views as his, could be held consistently in the Church; and he made the remarks concerning "*Waterland's Treatise*," to which I referred in my first communication. You seemed to support him in this, by directing my attention to the language used in the Catechism respecting the sacraments; remarking that "baptism is there declared to be, not only 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace,' but '*the means whereby we receive the same*.'" To this, I demurred. You still thought the definite article was used. I referred to the Prayer Book, and the mistake was evident. The sacrament is there declared

to be, not "*the* means," but "*a* means," &c. In this I acknowledge my belief. I conceded that, to all those who receive baptism rightly, (and no adult believer receives it rightly who is not exercising a justifying faith,) it is both "a means of grace and a pledge to assure us thereof."

9. I argued that the view of Bro. ——— would involve the doctrine of justification, in part, by works. You interrupted me in a tone of decided rebuke; "What! do you consider baptism a work? It is not a work—it is the act of God. I am as much opposed to the doctrine of justification by works as you are." I replied in substance that, in reference to its spiritual benefits, "baptism is an act of God;" but that, with respect to the resolution of the sinner to be baptized, and his coming forward to receive the sacrament, it is a "work," because here is something which a sinner may do of himself—something external, upon which he may rest, even as the Jew did upon circumcision—that, therefore, baptism must be excluded from any part in the office of justifying.

10. Brother ——— asserted that St. Paul was not justified in the sight of God, prior to his baptism by Ananias. I expressed great surprise at this declaration—made some remarks respecting Paul's conversion, &c., when you asked me how I could account for the words spoken by Ananias, (Acts xxii. 16,) "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins," &c. I answered that, "did this passage stand alone, there might be reason to interpret it literally. But that, scripture must be interpreted by scripture, and that there is so much in the New Testament to show that justification is of God independent of baptism, especially as set forth by St. Paul, that I found no difficulty in looking upon the passage as figurative." [St. Paul had been converted—he had shown the submission of the Christian in asking, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He had obeyed the Lord's direction by going to Damascus. He was also declared to be a chosen vessel unto Christ—he had received sight at the hands of Ananias, and yet it would seem he was not justified in the sight of God, because he had not been baptized. I say again what I said at the examination, "I do not so understand the gospel."]

11. I appealed to St. Paul's argument in his epistles to

the Romans and Galatians, as conclusive that, baptism, no more than circumcision, has any part in the sinner's justification. Brother ——— would not admit the force of that appeal. He said that "St. Paul had reference specially to Jewish views and prejudices," and would not admit his reasoning to apply to the subject-matter in discussion. You were engaged at the time, in referring to a book in your hands, and did not notice the remark. I called your attention particularly to it, whereupon Bro. ——— went into a sort of analysis of the epistle to the Romans, which left the subject where it was before.

12. I referred to the nature of Abraham's justifying faith—that it was exercised before circumcision—that Abraham received the "sign of circumcision" as "a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had, being uncircumcised"—that so it is with the adult believer under the gospel. He must have this justifying faith before he can receive baptism rightly. The latter is to him the "sign and seal of the righteousness of faith" which he has, being unbaptized. The sacrament, therefore, does not convey justification—does not add to it, or make it more complete than it was before. It signs, seals, assures, and confirms the blessings which belong to the faith which has already justified. To my inference from the nature of Abraham's faith, you objected on this ground, namely, that, in all cases, Abraham's descendants were circumcised *before* they exercised a justifying faith—that his was the only instance where justification took place previous to circumcision. I will not pursue the argument that followed, but would remind you that I did not admit its validity.

13. Brother ——— had objected to the statement that, the Homilies are to be considered authoritative with respect to doctrine. I referred to the appendage to the thirty-fifth article, in which it is stated that, the Homilies are to be viewed as an "explication of Christian doctrine." He replied that, "this is contained in a note to the article and not in the article itself." I remarked that, "the note was added by our own branch of the Church, and therefore is equally binding with the article." Of this I should think there could be no reasonable doubt.

14. I referred to the Homilies, and read large portions

where the doctrine of justification by faith alone, independent of any thing external, is set forth in such plain terms that it would seem impossible to misapprehend them. But Bro. ——— contended that, the allusion to the baptism of infants and to sins committed after baptism, contained in the first part of the Homily of the Salvation of Mankind, implied that all that followed respecting justification by faith alone, “had reference to the faith of those who had been baptized.” Of course, he intended the inference that, baptism is essential to the justification there spoken of. You also turned to some passages in the Homilies where baptism is spoken of in a way, which you thought more consistent with Brother ———’s view than with mine.

15. *At no time during the whole examination would Bro. ——— admit to me that the penitent believing sinner is justified in the sight of God before baptism.*

I have thus, my dear Bishop, called your attention to such parts of the examination, as I can recollect with perfect distinctness, so far as is necessary to show that, the difference between Bro. ——— and myself, is not a mere difference respecting terms and phraseology. It is radical—it is vital. Either a man is justified before God by faith *alone*, or he is not. If he is, then neither baptism nor obedience have any thing to do with justifying. They are indeed necessary to show this faith to the world; but they are not identified with it in the office of justifying.

I will now advert briefly to the *private* interview which I had with Bro. ——— at your house on Saturday morning. The substance of this interview was stated in my first communication. Referring you to that, I will only add a few particulars in farther confirmation of it.

1. Among other things, Bro. ——— went into an illustration at some length, to which he desired my particular attention. Without entering upon its merits, I interrupted him with the remark, “All this discussion is useless and a waste of time—nothing can be gained by it. There is a plain, simple question, which is easily answered, yes or no. If in my view you are sound on this doctrine, you will say “yes,” if not, you will say “no.” “Do you believe that in the sight of God, the truly penitent

and believing sinner is justified before baptism?" He evaded the question as involving an "*abstraction*." When I continued to press it, he answered as before, "*he is not fully justified*."

2. I remarked to him that Dr. Crocker would find the same fault with his views that I did, and would have the same difficulty in presenting him. He replied, "I suppose so—I have no doubt of it." Now, Dr. Crocker has ministered in the same pulpit for more than forty years. There is no disguise with regard to his doctrinal views. We all know them, and he has always been considered sound on the subject of justification by faith. When, therefore, Bro. ——— admitted so readily that, his views on justification would be considered unsound by the Rev. Dr. Crocker; was there not a consciousness that there is a radical difference between them on this subject?

3. I would direct your attention to another significant fact. At the last interview which I had with ———, previous to his ordination, he said to me, (referring to the examination of the Deacons,) "I understand that Mr. K. answered your questions on justification, essentially the same as I did. Why do you not object to him?" I replied, "you are mistaken; there is an essential difference between your answers and his. When I pressed him to say, whether in the sight of God, the truly penitent and believing sinner is justified before baptism, he admitted it. But you will not say so." Upon this he turned from me, and was about ascending the stairs, when I called to him and repeated the question, "Will you admit that the penitent and believing sinner is justified in the sight of God before baptism?" He answered twice, "not fully, not fully." This was the last communication I had with him on the subject.

[Now, my dear Bishop, in view of these facts, you see it is not possible that he should misunderstand me, or that I should misunderstand him. He knew perfectly well that he had but to admit that, in the sight (not of "men, or of the Church," but) of God, the penitent, believing sinner, is justified before baptism, and the difficulty would be removed. I knew perfectly well from his own declarations that, he did not believe this, and therefore could not say it. It was thus plain that, I could not assent to his ordination as one sound in fundamentals. You say

indeed, that "*afterward*," in explaining to *you* his meaning, when he declared that the sinner is not "fully" or "completely justified before baptism," he said, "that is, he is not so to be accounted in the sight of God and of the Church, until he is declared to be so in baptism." I pause not here to inquire into the propriety of speaking of justification "before men and the Church," when the subject of discussion is, what is taught in the *eleventh article of the Church*, which speaks only of justification before God; a sort of explanation which looks like a continued evasion of the real question involved.* But I must say that, whatever ——— may have said to you in *private*; whatever statement he may now make in public; whether he shall modify his views or not; this cannot change the facts upon which the other examining Presbyter and myself were obliged to form an opinion at the examination. *He* agrees with me with respect to ———'s views on this important doctrine, and for the very same reasons. He has read my statement to you, and in every important particular, pronounces it correct. The only thing which, in his opinion, needed correction is, the unessential circumstance that the question which I state he addressed to ———, he did in fact address to both the candidates, and that ——— took it upon himself to reply. You also state in your letter, "I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination." Now, the opinion of the examining Presbyters must be based upon the examination and statements made to us, *and not upon any private statements made to yourself*. And if, when you were present with us, we were not satisfied with the statements made by ———, with which statements you did appear satisfied, of course it cannot be expected that private statements, when we were not present, will be satisfactory. In *every instance*, at the examination, when I went *behind* your questions, or explanations, and asked ——— a question which could be answered yes, or no, the answer was *not* satisfactory. I am bound, in justice to ———'s love for consistency and what he considers truth, to believe that, should I now go *behind* the explanation he has given you in private, and should ask him again, "do you believe that, in the sight of God, the justification of the truly penitent, *believing sinner*, is complete before baptism," he would still

answer, "no." And if he would thus answer, then, if I understand the gospel and the doctrines of the Church, he is unsound. This is not the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which Paul taught, and which the Church teaches.

Again: You say, "he has to me more than once disclaimed his belief in the absurd theory of progressive justification." I do not doubt it. The "theory" is too "absurd" for a reasonable man to hold professedly in the Church. But I must still think that, his view of justification *involves* the "absurd theory," and that it is a fair argument to use in refutation of his error. To say that, "the penitent sinner is not fully justified in the sight of God before baptism," is to imply that, *in part, he is justified*. If then, the sinner is partly justified before baptism, and fully justified after baptism, then is justification divided into parts; and if into parts, what is this but "the absurd theory of progressive justification?"

And now, my dear Bishop, I feel at liberty to close this unpleasant discussion. That I should be placed in this attitude with respect to yourself, is like a painful dream. I can scarcely realize that it is so. Nothing but the consciousness of having done what I conceived my duty, consoles me. I hear not the voice of that accusing conscience to which I should have been compelled to listen, had I either presented our friend, or joined in the imposition of hands at the ordination. I regret deeply that, I did not absent myself altogether from the church on that occasion. My constraining motive in being there was to oblige you, in presenting the Deacons. You had, as I supposed, for my sake, as well as for ——'s, procured the attendance of a third Presbyter, who would also be the presenter. You had thus removed all the barriers in my way, and I felt that I could not refuse to be present and perform the only duty which I supposed was devolved upon me. But, my dear Bishop, I misunderstood you, and you misunderstood me. Hence the unhappy result. Most earnestly do I pray that, it may be overruled for good. For your kindness and assurances of continued regard, I fervently thank you. May no similar occasion again occur, to mar the harmony you are so anxious to promote. Throughout your Episcopate, may you be blessed with an united and happy Diocese, loving the

truth as it is in Jesus, and steadfastly maintaining the pure faith of the gospel.

Very respectfully and sincerely,
Your Presbyter,
JAS. W. COOKE.

[LETTER NO. V.]

PROVIDENCE, Thursday Evening, Jan. 21, 1847.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw, D. D.

Dear Sir :—The enclosed communication was finished soon after date, but the expediency of obtaining a copy, which pressing duties did not permit me to attempt myself; and then, a desire to submit that portion of it relating to the examination, to the other examining Presbyter, the Rev. Mr. Horton, have led me to retain it till the present moment. I did not have an opportunity of seeing Mr. Horton, till to-day. His recollection accords with mine as to all the facts which transpired at the examination. He pronounces the several particulars of the statement substantially correct, and does not dissent from any fact or particular mentioned. I have been very careful to state nothing which I do not recollect with perfect distinctness. But I presume that, in reference to the *facts*, there will be no dissent on your part.

I will add that, I have handed to the printer an extract commencing with the last paragraph on page eighth, [MS.] and concluding with the first paragraph on page tenth.*

Very respectfully and sincerely, your Presbyter,
JAS. W. COOKE.

As the only Presbyter present with me at the examination, the Rev. Mr. Horton, is referred to in the above communication, and in other places in the course of this correspondence, it is but just to that Reverend Brother, to state precisely, his relative position to the parties in this controversy. As a young Presbyter, he modestly refrained from asking but few questions in the course of the examination. He did, however, propound *the* question, the answer to which, by ———, involved the protracted discussion which ensued, and which was followed by the difficulties which gave rise to this correspondence. I do not remember, however, that the Rev. Mr. H. took any part in

* By referring to page 35, the reader will see this extract, enclosed in brackets. The reasons why the *whole* letter is printed will be stated in *another* place.

this discussion, except to make the suggestion already mentioned, that it was possible that Mr. ——— did not understand by the word “justification” the same as myself. On my return to my parish after the ordination, I wrote my first letter to the Bishop. It being a simple statement of facts, which I knew must be familiar to all the parties, and as just to one as the other; (at least, it was conscientiously so intended;) I did not submit it to the inspection of Mr. Horton, but sent it directly to the Bishop. In relation to it, the Bishop wrote in reply: “I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination”;—an admission which I felt to be justly due. I then wrote my reply to the Bishop’s letter. This I took with me to Providence, where I attended the Convocation at Grace Church. The day following the Convocation, I conversed *for the first time with the Rev. Mr. Horton on the subject*. It may also be proper to remark that, I had no correspondence with him, nor had the subject been directly or indirectly discussed between us. Though I felt sure he must sanction what I had written respecting the examination, in both my letters, yet I did not know his opinion *till more than a fortnight had thus elapsed from the time of ordination*. I was, therefore, gratified, though not surprised, to find that his recollection of the facts was in accordance with my own. Very naturally, however, he felt great delicacy in having his name mentioned in connection with this very unpleasant affair. The Rev. Mr. ——— was a personal friend of his; and indeed, *was sojourning at his house, at the very time of the examination and ordination*. Besides, he desired to show all respect to his Bishop; and not to say or do any thing, unnecessarily, that might give offence. At the same time he felt bound, as a man and a Christian, to recognise his obligation to express his opinion of the fairness and correctness of my statements. He did so, to my entire satisfaction; at the same time expressing his earnest desire and hope, that it would not be found necessary to publish the correspondence. These remarks are made without his knowledge.

[LETTER NO. VI.]

PROVIDENCE, January 22d, 1847.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw, D. D.

My Dear Bishop :—My Statement, &c., is in the hands of the Printer, and in great part, is in type. I have very deliberately weighed your suggestion that there is not sufficient necessity for publishing it, and that evils might grow out of the publication. I have an anxious desire to meet your wishes, as far as possible, consistent with justice to all the parties concerned. I might repeat the reasons for publishing which I suggested to you in conversation—but this is not necessary. I will add that, in various quarters, some reports, unwarranted by the facts, and injurious to yourself, exist in relation to this subject, which will be removed by the publication of all the circumstances. For myself, and the cause of truth, I deem it necessary that all the facts of the case should be known where a partial knowledge of it already exists. Bro. ——— has circulated a private statement of his views—which also has been repeated and circulated by others, which leaves a very different impression from that which, I am confident, the statement of *all* the facts would produce. I do not mean to impugn his statement, for I have not seen it, and therefore cannot judge of its merits—I speak merely of its effect. Now, to multiply copies of my statement by the pen, sufficient for this purpose, is impracticable. How then shall I meet the difficulty? I know of but one way, and that is, by *printing for private circulation, without publishing*. This will meet, in some measure, the necessity of the case, and avoid the evils which you think consequent on a public discussion. I am assured by publishers that, the newspapers will not feel at liberty to make the matter public, if the restriction is printed on the cover. This course will devolve a heavy expense upon myself, whereas in the other case, it will be wholly borne by the publisher: but if more agreeable to your views and wishes, I will cheerfully bear this expense. If, however, you have not a decided preference for this course, I will adopt the other. I will thank you to send a note in reply by the bearer.

Very respectfully and sincerely,

Your Presbyter,

JAS. W. COOKE.

[LETTER NO. VII.]

PROVIDENCE, January 22d, 1847.

Rev. and Dear Sir :—In reply to your note of this day, I can only repeat, what I have said to you before, that I am fully persuaded no good can result to any party—and much harm may result from any publication relating to the unhappy differences which have arisen out of the circumstances connected with the

late Ordination. I, of course, cannot dictate in the matter which you have submitted to me in your note. Any result would be gratifying to me, which would insure harmony among brethren, and prevent scandal upon the cause of Christ.

In our interview on the 8th, I suggested that the difference (which I am still persuaded is not fundamental,) might be arranged by mutual explanations in the presence of the clergy, or say six senior Presbyters to act as umpires and paternal advisers in the case. This proposition I again renew to you. If it be acceded to by yourself and ———, I feel a strong persuasion that, by God's blessing and grace, the threatening breach may be closed, all unkind feeling be removed, the peace and purity of the Church be preserved, and His holy name glorified. Let me once more urge you, Rev. and Dear Sir, to consent to this suggestion—the particulars of the arrangement might be fixed by consultation or correspondence between the parties chiefly interested.

If, contrary to my earnest hope and desire, you shall still deem it necessary either to publish or print, I have to request the privilege of addressing a note of explanation to you, suggested by one or two points in your second and third letters, before the matter goes to press.

In much haste,

I remain very affectionately,

Your friend and brother,

J. P. K. HENSHAW.

[LETTER NO. VIII.]

PROVIDENCE, January 22d, 1847.

Rt. Rev. and Dear Sir:—I have just received your reply to my note of this day. I regret that you should raise the question again, whether it is expedient to print at all? The matter would not have been submitted to the printer, nor would the contingency mentioned in my note of to-day, have been presented for your consideration, had not the subject been most carefully and deliberately viewed in all its bearings. Most deeply—most sincerely—do I desire to meet all your wishes. But, for reasons already given—for others which might be mentioned—I do not feel at liberty to make this now an open question. I did not suppose you could infer this from my note. I wished to know, whether you had a decided preference for printing for private circulation, rather than for publishing? If so, I was willing to incur the heavy expense which would devolve on me—and I will now add that, I will also print at my own expense, the additional explanations, to which you refer in your note of to-day. But I am at a loss to infer from your note, whether you consider it really a matter of much importance, whether to print or publish? If you have not a decided preference for the former, I do

not wish to incur the expense, and shall proceed to publish. I will thank you, therefore, to state frankly, whether you consider it important, and would decidedly prefer the course which I suggested.

In reference to your recommendation to submit the case to the arbitration of the clergy, or "six senior Presbyters," I would say respectfully that, I can see no good that would arise from it. Should they arrive at a decision, the grounds of that decision must, after all, be made known, in order to meet the necessity of the case. Besides, if a Presbyter, whether senior or junior, should sit upon the case, whose opinions harmonise with ———, it would be natural for me to object to him; and another difficulty would arise, involving unpleasant personal considerations. Or again, should Presbyters, varying in opinion, sit upon the case, there would be, inevitably, a division in the result; creating great excitement, and engendering party feelings, in the Church in this Diocese. I am persuaded, my dear Bishop, that the best way is, just to state the simple facts, and there let the matter rest.

I will thank you to send the additional explanations of which you speak, this evening, if possible, as the copy is wanted.

Very respectfully and sincerely,

Your Presbyter,

JAS. W. COOKE.

The reader has now all the correspondence before him, up to the above date. He views the case just as it was presented to the parties, from the beginning. My own aim has been to show, precisely the position in which I have stood, by a statement of facts. I have not desired that this publication should be *ex parte*. I have wished that the Bishop should have full opportunity to state, explain, modify, or justify. Accordingly, I said to him a fortnight since, that, if he desired to add anything to his former statement, I would cheerfully publish it. I repeated the same proposal on the 22d January, in note No. 8. And it has been with me a ground of thankfulness that, however unpleasant the discussion, it has been conducted without involving unkind feelings, or any violation of gentlemanly and Christian courtesy.

The reader, therefore, no less than myself, will, doubtless, be unprepared for the altered tone of the following communication from the Bishop. It is dated on the same day with the kindly note, No. 7; but the tenor of a portion of it, is to me, the occasion of heartfelt sorrow. I do not feel at liberty to reply, *as I might*, if it came from any other source. I have no issue to

make with my Bishop on mere personal grounds. I shall explain what may seem inconsistent, and state facts. But, if my letters do not show the absence of an improper spirit, (and of that, the christian public must judge;) and if evident facts do not justify my conduct, (of which also, the christian public must judge;) I shall be disappointed.

Preliminary to the perusal of the Bishop's communication, I would request the reader's attention to a few particulars.

A large portion of the "explanations" is occupied with items of the Bishop's personal history, ministrations, publications, &c., to which he appeals for evidence of his soundness in the faith in years past. Now I wish it to be understood distinctly that, I have no desire to make issue with the Bishop himself, on points of doctrine; and, I think, the reader will do me the justice to say that, I have appeared to do so, only so far, as the facts of the case, seem to imply it. For this, I cannot be responsible. But, *I have drawn no inferences from these facts, nor built any argument upon them, for the purpose of questioning my Bishop's theology.* And when I received note No. 7, requesting "the privilege of addressing a note of explanation suggested by one or two points in (my) second and third letters before the matter goes to press;" my hope was that, the Bishop might be able so to explain several points, that there would be no room for misapprehending his views. Nothing would have given me more pleasure than to read, and to *print*, a declaration from the Bishop to this effect—"I believe that the truly penitent sinner is completely justified by faith, in the sight of God before baptism." This was the only question presented at the examination as the ground of difference; and one which may be answered, either affirmatively or negatively, in a single sentence. I regret that, inasmuch as the "explanations" are comprised in twenty pages of closely written manuscript, the Bishop has not directed his attention, even for a moment, to the one important question which caused the difficulty, both at the examination and ordination. He does, indeed, speak of his view of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, in the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; but he does not say whether, by these merits, the truly penitent sinner is completely justified, in the sight of God, *before baptism.* This is *the* question raised at the examination; and all that the

Bishop has said, in the following communication, on the subject of justification by faith alone, and on the sacraments, (excellent as his remarks are, in all of which I coincide;) may be said, and will be said, *as well by those who answer this important question negatively, as by those who answer it affirmatively.*

In this connection I would make another remark. The greater part of the Bishop's communication is occupied by matters not in discussion between us.

The first four manuscript pages relate to his views of the inexpediency of bringing the case before the public.

The last eight manuscript pages are limited to personal considerations growing out of this discussion.

The remaining eight pages alone, relate to the points at issue. Respecting these, I wish the reader to observe distinctly, in view of the explanations given, that, there is *not a material fact, respecting which I am left at issue with the Bishop.* But, inasmuch as the Bishop's remarks involve many considerations not strictly relevant to the subject matter in discussion, I must request the reader to bear in mind the following particulars in the perusal, both of his communication, and of my reply.

1. To keep constantly in view the essential points at issue ; viz. (1.) Was I justified at the examination, in declaring —— to be unsound, because he would not admit that, the truly penitent believing sinner is completely justified by faith, in the sight of God, before baptism ? (2.) Was I justified, in view of all the circumstances, in declining to join with the Bishop in the imposition of hands at the ordination ? (3.) Is my statement of facts a true statement ?

2. To distinguish between that which is relevant, and that which is irrelevant, to these issues.

3. When reference is made to the previous correspondence, to examine the reference itself in its proper connection.

4. To observe whether, after the explanations given, there is really any material *fact* at issue between the Bishop and myself ?

5. After perusing the whole, to inquire, whether the case, as to all essential points, does not stand where it did before ?

[LETTER NO IX.]

PROVIDENCE, Jan. 22d, 1847.

Rev. and Dear Sir :—When you waited upon me, in company with your brother, to notify me of your purpose to publish a pamphlet in self-vindication ; which you represented yourself as being constrained to by the earnest solicitations of your personal and family friends, and which your brother declared you had that day given him a pledge to do—you may recollect that I earnestly but affectionately endeavored to dissuade you from taking a step which, as it would probably provoke a reply from ———, might prove the commencement of strife in our hitherto peaceful and united Diocese. I spoke of the injury done to religion by disputes among Christians ; of the disgrace brought upon our Church by controversies which had taken place in some other Dioceses ; and of the impropriety and evil of making the public a court of appeal in reference to points of doctrine or discipline in the Church. I then renewedly expressed the opinion that an interview between yourself and ———, in the presence of some clerical friends, would probably show that the difference between you did not affect the vital doctrines of the Gospel, and would probably lead to satisfactory explanations and an amicable result. I named the Rev. Dr. Crocker, the Rev. Mr. Taft, Rev. Mr. Vail, and others of the senior Presbyters in the Diocese, as suitable persons to be present at such an interview, whose sound judgment and kind offices might lead to a peaceable and quiet adjustment of this family difference. This suggestion received no favorable response from you. And although you expressed regret that you were placed in such circumstances, yet you pleaded the urgency of your friends and the promise that day given to your brother, as reasons why necessity was laid upon you to proceed in your contemplated appeal to the public in your own vindication. The strength of your language, and the excitement of your manner, gave me reason to fear that there was very little ground to hope that your purpose would be changed. Believing it still to be my duty as your Bishop and friend, to leave no effort untried to prevent your taking a step which, so far as I could perceive, would be productive of no good to yourself, and would certainly prove injurious to the cause of religion in the Church, I earnestly advised you to consult with some of your clerical brethren, and to give yourself to calm deliberation and prayer, for the purpose of ascertaining your duty ; and once more begged you, in the spirit of christian kindness and affection, to reflect upon the fearful evils that would follow a publication which would probably provoke a reply, and disturb, to some extent, that ecclesiastical harmony which has heretofore been our boast and our blessing. You replied that “ you had thought of all these things ;

your mind was made up, and you could not abandon your purpose," or words to the same effect.

If, therefore, any injury either to yourself, or ———, to the Diocese, or to the cause of Christ and His blessed Gospel, should arise from the publication of your pamphlet, I am free from all blame in regard to it. I can sincerely say that I employed my best endeavors to preserve the harmony and purity of that ecclesiastical household of which God, in His Providence and Grace, has made me (however unworthy) the visible head.

I warned you against a measure which I foresaw would be productive of evil, but my counsels were unheeded. I proposed a reference of the difficulties which had arisen between you and a brother clergyman to the umpireship of a council of senior Presbyters; but the proposition was rejected. As to all the resulting consequences, you have assumed the responsibility, and upon you it must rest.

At the close of that interview above referred to, which took place in my study on the evening of January 8th instant, you remarked that you would, as an act of justice to myself, insert at length my reply to your first letter, as a part of the forthcoming pamphlet; and inquired whether I desired to make additions to it. My reply was, "it was a private letter in answer to certain inquiries in one I had received from you. But I have no objection to its being read by any who have an interest in the matter. I know not that I have a desire to add any thing to it." On taking leave you put into my hands another document, which I have since found to be an elaborate and specific review of the only letter I have written upon this unpleasant subject. That document was dated Dec. 30th, 1846. On returning home at a late hour last evening, (January 21,) I found a third document bearing date January 11th.

Until yesterday I entertained the hope, from rumors which reached me, that you would yield to the solicitations of some of your friends, by abandoning the idea of publication. But inferring from your note of to-day, that you will either publish or print, I deem it my duty to send you a few remarks upon two or three points in your later letters, which, if left unexplained, might leave an erroneous impression upon the mind of the reader.

1. In your second letter to me, under the head *Objection 2*, you seem to imply that my impression that your only desire was to be relieved from a specific part in the ordination, viz. the presentment of ———, was founded rather on my own *inference*, from what you said, than on any distinct declaration of yours. How you could educe such a conclusion from such premises, without an implied distrust of my veracity or my memory, it is difficult for me to conceive. By turning to that part of my letter to which this objection applies, you will find the

following explicit language. "I was grieved to learn that, after it, (your private interview with ———,) you felt, no less strongly than before, that you could not conscientiously *present ——— and make the declaration required from the presenter*. Still I was glad to hear you state, (as you did most explicitly,) that you would make no opposition to the ordination, and had no desire to throw any obstacle in the way of it; but that your only desire was to be relieved from a specific part in it, which you could not conscientiously perform. I made no effort—I used no persuasion to change your purpose in this particular, for I rigidly respect scruples of conscience."

Here I say nothing of *inferences* or conjectures, but make an unequivocal statement of *facts*. Subsequent reflection has fully confirmed my belief in the literal truth of this statement. It is a matter about which I feel as confident as it is possible to feel about any past occurrence. If there were no other reliance in the case except upon present recollection, I might, perhaps, in view of the fuller declarations since made by you, entertain some doubtfulness as to the point. But this is not my only reliance. The duties of my office render it necessary for me to keep a daily journal—and in that journal all important occurrences relating to the Church are recorded. In that journal, under date of Dec. 18th, (the day of the examination of ——— and my son for Priest's orders) I find a record of the examination, from which the following is an extract. "The result was, Mr. Cooke told me that he would not object to the ordination of ———, but that he could not conscientiously be his presenter, because he could not say the words required from the presenting Presbyterian." This minute was made almost immediately after the examination closed, when all the facts were fresh in my mind, and leaves no room for uncertainty as to this important fact.

If, then, my firm conviction that in regard to the ordination of ———, you had no wish to obstruct it, but only to be excused from officiating as his presenter, was unfounded; you will, my dear sir, do me the justice to admit, that there was apparent ground for it in the language used, and the declarations made by you at the time. Your words afforded me the only clue by which I could gain access to the purposes and feelings of your mind.

2. In the same letter, under *Objection 4*, as a reason for entertaining the expectation that a third Presbyterian would be present, you say: "I supposed that Bro. Hathaway would constitute the third Presbyterian. I had no idea that [Bro.] Horton would be sent to take his place. When, sometime before, I had suggested an arrangement which would take [Bro.] Horton away, you remarked 'that cannot be, for [Bro.] Horton must be present.' I felt, therefore, perfectly at ease." My dear Sir, have you

forgotten the circumstances under which the words you have here ascribed to me were used? I was about making an arrangement for the supply of your pulpit for the express purpose of enabling you to remain and assist in the ordination. Our reliance had been upon the Rev. Mr. Dennison, who had engaged to preach in Bristol in the expectation that he could obtain a supply for his church in Portsmouth from Newport. On Friday evening I received a letter from Mr. D., stating that, owing to the severe storm of the night before, it would be impracticable for him to communicate with Newport in time to insure the carrying out of our original purpose for the supply of St. Michael's, Bristol. It was after ascertaining this, (and I believe the next morning,) when I proposed to request the Rev. Mr. Child to supply your place in Bristol. It was then you suggested that the Rev. Mr. Horton should go. I replied, that cannot be, he *must* be present. And why make this reply? Surely not, because I was expecting another Presbyterian: but for a reason the very reverse. Mr. Child, being a Deacon, could be spared. Mr. Horton, being a Presbyterian, could not be; for then you would be left as the *only* Presbyterian on whose assistance I could rely in the services of the ordination, and two were necessary; one to present the candidates for priesthood, the other to present the candidates for the diaconate. How you could connect this circumstance with the expectation of Mr. Hathaway's coming, I cannot conjecture. For, so far as I am informed, nothing was said of sending for Mr. H. until the afternoon of Saturday, and then, for the reason assigned in my first letter.

3. In the same letter, under *Objection 7*, speaking of the circumstances connected with the act of ordination—and your feelings of distress on discovering, as you did before the service was over, that only two Presbyters were present, you remark: "I honestly thought that [Bro.] Horton would yet come in and relieve my anxiety, and save both my Bishop and myself from the unpleasant consequences that followed. The contingency was continually before me, 'will [Bro.] Horton finish the services at St. Andrew's in season, or has he determined not to be present.' *I did not yield the expectation of his presence till the last moment!*"

Whatever might have been your impression at the time, you have long ere this, I presume, been convinced, that no one else of the parties concerned, neither the candidates for ordination, Mr. Hathaway, nor myself, had the slightest expectation that any third Presbyterian would make his appearance to take part in the solemn services. Yet, you were so confidently looking for Mr. Horton, that you "*did not yield the expectation of his presence till the last moment.*" I infer from the underscoring of these words, that you attach great importance to them, and *rely upon the statement they convey as constituting your chief*

apology for refusal to unite in the imposition of hands on Mr. ———.

I am willing to give you the full benefit of this plea. I am bound to give entire credit to your declaration, "I honestly believed that [Bro.] Horton would yet come in and relieve my anxiety, and save both my Bishop and myself from the unpleasant consequences that followed." But this does by no means relieve my mind from the perplexities of this embarrassing case. How naturally might it have been expected that a man who had been laboring under such "anxiety" of mind, and had been grievously disappointed by the non-arrival of confidently expected relief, would speak of his disappointment and express his regret, so soon as he had an opportunity of unbosoming himself to those who had been grieved and wounded by his conduct? How natural would it have been for you, standing in the relation you did to myself, to have embraced the first moment that offered after the benediction was pronounced, for saying, "Bishop, I am grieved and mortified at what has occurred; but I assure you it was unintentional and unpremeditated on my part. I confidently expected the arrival of Mr. Horton to relieve you and me from the unpleasant occurrence which has taken place." Would not such an avowal have been dictated by the promptings of an affectionate heart, grieved itself for having proved, however innocently, the occasion of grief to others? Did you, my Reverend friend and brother, make any such avowal to your Bishop or the clergy after that mournful occurrence? I can speak only for myself. We were together some moments in the chancel after the communicants retired. We were afterwards together for some time in the vestry-room. Yet you uttered not one word of apology or explanation; you expressed no regret for what had taken place; you manifested no disappointment that a third Presbyter had not appeared; you made no inquiry where Mr. Horton was, or why your expectation of his coming had not been realized. Here is something in relation to human feeling and human action too deep for my philosophy to fathom.

4. Your third letter, delivered at my house last evening, and which I had no opportunity to look into till this morning, contains so much in relation to the examination and to the mooted question of the orthodoxy of Mr. ——— and others, that I have no desire to enter upon a review of it. I fear I could not do so without being forced into the position of a *controversialist*. The honors of such a position are among the last I should be disposed to covet. Far less would I be willing so far to forget what is due to my own character, and to the dignity of the office which I (so unworthily) hold in the Church of God, as to be lured or driven into a controversy with one to whom I hold the relation of a spiritual father and friend.

There is, however, one thing in that letter, which I cannot

with propriety allow to pass before the public unaccompanied with certain qualifications.

On page ninth (manuscript), after assuring me of Mr. Horton's having read your statement and pronouncing it to be correct in every important particular; you proceed to quote these words from my answer to your first letter: "I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination"; evidently relying upon this as giving my sanction to the accuracy of all your statements. Now, my dear Sir, when the quoted words were written, I had seen only your first letter, and, of course, they can be legitimately applied to that only. And may not a statement be, to use the language of Mr. Horton, "correct in every *important* particular," and nevertheless be defective in some minor particulars, a correct understanding of which, in all their relations and connexions, would throw a new light over the whole matter, and give it an entirely different aspect? If, to use my own words, (which I presume are correctly quoted,) "I have no fault to find with the *general* accuracy of your report of the examination," does it from thence fairly follow, that no objection can be made to some of its *details*? May not a statement be *generally* correct as to leading facts, and yet be so *circumstantially* erroneous, so mixed up with special pleadings to make out a case, so ingeniously and skilfully arranged as to the collocation of particulars, that, upon the whole, it constitutes a gloss and commentary rather than a history, and presents to the reader's mind a prejudiced and distorted view of the real merits of the case?

Such things are not uncommon in the history of human controversies, or even in that of human jurisprudence. You must excuse me, therefore, if I cannot consent to your making use of a sentence in my answer to your first letter, (written without a spirit of discussion, and without any view to publication, but in the frankness of fraternal confidence,) which shall be construed into a sanction on my part of the accuracy of the statements, far less of the arguments, the inferences, and the inuendoes scattered over the whole of your three letters.

In the last letter, you undertake to report not only the answers of Mr. ———, but also the remarks and observations made by your own Bishop in the course of an examination which you was conducting at his request. There are things in that letter which I read with deep regret, and which, as I believe, when the time of calm, prayerful, Christian deliberation comes, you will reflect upon with sorrow.

Are there not, my dear and Reverend Brother, things in that letter which you neither desired nor expected me to approve? Are there not sentences in it upon which the eye of Christian charity would fain drop a tear in the hope that it would blot them out? Are there not dark hints and intimations which

would not bear exposure in the light of conscience and before the mercy seat of God? I ask not these questions in a spirit of bitterness and displeasure, but, if I know my own heart, in the spirit of Christian faithfulness, but at the same time, of tenderness and love. Gladly would I kneel at your feet, and entreat you as a brother to abstain from the farther prosecution of this controversy. Expose not your own faults or those of your Christian brethren to the gaze of an unbelieving and scoffing world, already too much hardened by the influence of the strifes and quarrels of Christians. If the effect of your proposed pamphlet should be to fix a stain upon the reputation or disturb the peace of a young brother in the ministry, would it afford you any happiness? Would any benefit result from it either to yourself or to that cause which has claims upon us higher than any selfish considerations? If the effect of your pamphlet (whether designed or undesigned) should be to produce distrust of your Bishop in any quarter, and especially amongst any members of our own household of faith, can you possibly conceive that this could be of any benefit to yourself or to the church of which you are a minister and a member? If the result should be the excitement of jealousy and suspicion among the clergy, or of alienation and distrust between any pastors and their flocks; if, in process of time, our meetings of convocation are to be despoiled of their harmony; if our united prayers, our earnest preaching of Christ crucified, our zealous co-operation in the work of missions, are to be superseded by the spirit of polemical strife and jangling, who that has any love for Christ and for souls, would not unite with weeping angels in lamentation over the mournful change? Ah! my brother, "the beginning of strife is like the letting out of water," no one can calculate the power of the rising flood, or the extent of its ravages. The man who begins a controversy in the church may think he is but "sowing wind"; but who can envy his feelings when from this seed, the afflicted church is reaping the "whirlwind"?

But I must check myself in these reflections. They are but the overflowings of a heart deeply solicitous for the prosperity of the church, and that no part of the zeal and talent which should be employed in the work of saving souls may be wasted in domestic strife, or in a war of words. This letter has grown to an unexpected length, although it has been written at a sitting, and without any time for correction or review. If it contains any thing which may be considered as giving just cause of offence to you, I assure you it is undesigned, and I pray God to forgive it. If there were time for careful review, I might alter and correct; but your note, which has just come to hand, about nine o'clock P. M., informs me that "copy" is wanted, and urges me to send the additional explanations spoken of in my note to you of this morning. I am sorry that you again

decline the proposal to submit the matter of difference between yourself and Mr. ——— to the calm examination and Christian decision of "the clergy" or of "six of the senior Presbyters of the Diocese," which I renewed in my answer to your note of this morning. I have the testimony of conscience, that my best efforts have been used to prevent any injury or scandal which may be brought upon the church by a controversy (which I fear any publication upon this subject will be likely to produce) which I believe to be entirely uncalled for.

I shall now bring this letter to a conclusion ; and I am sorry that a feeling of self-respect compels me to do so with a reference to myself.

I may possibly have misjudged the bearing of certain parts of this correspondence, and ascribed to them a meaning which did not enter your design. Should this be so, what I am now to say will be considered as betraying undue sensitiveness with regard to personal reputation, even where, as in my case, that reputation is intimately connected (on account of official station) with a cause which ought to be, and I trust is, dearer to me than life.

To avoid therefore the possibility of ascribing to you motives of which you are unconscious, and ends which did not enter your design, I shall put what I have to say into the hypothetical form.

If there be in your letters an intimation that your Bishop had not intelligence enough to comprehend the drift of your questions or of the full meaning of ———'s answers ; or that he was unable to perceive the difference between a man's being *justified before God*, and his being *declared* and *accounted* righteous before men and the Church, I need not feel anxious to disprove it ; because I am sure that with those who know me, such an intimation can do me no harm. If there be anything in your letters looking like the slightest insinuation that your Bishop is unsound as to the doctrine of man's justification before God—or anything calculated to produce the impression, among those who know him not, that he is indifferent about doctrinal truth, and willing to wink at or abet the teaching of heresy, I can only say that it is unworthy of my notice, and appeal to my whole life as affording a practical denial of it.

It is a bootless employment to be contending against insinuations and shadows. There are times when a man must stand firmly upon the consciousness of his own integrity. When he may properly say with the Apostle, "It is a small thing for me to be judged of you, or of man's judgment ; *He that judgeth me is the Lord.*" Such times are these unhappy ones of suspicion, distrust and calumny upon which we are now fallen. My life has not been an obscure one. It has, to a certain extent, been "known and read of all men." And, through mercy, it may

be held up as a shield against the shafts of detraction, if any should be disposed to assail me in this way. For thirty-three years, and more, I have borne an humble part in the ministry of reconciliation, received in its lowest order from the hands of the venerated Bishop Griswold, to whose admirable teachings and example I am much indebted for what was most valuable in my early theological training; and to whose soundness in the faith I have often borne the most cordial testimony. From the year 1818 to the present time, I have not unfrequently published works on the doctrines and duties of Christianity. I challenge any one to produce, from any of those publications, whether in the form of single sermons and tracts, or of entire volumes, a single page or line that conflicts in the slightest degree with the Eleventh Article of our Church, or any other of the 39.

I have held the pastoral office ever since I was twenty-one years of age, and the scene of my ministry has been chiefly in two of the largest congregations in our country. Of the thousands who have attended upon my ministry in other states; of the members of the congregation of Grace Church in this city; of the members of the Church in the different parishes of Rhode Island, let one be produced, whether man, woman, or child, who will accuse me of opposing the doctrine of justification through faith alone in the merits of Jesus Christ, or of teaching anything inconsistent with it. I have gloried, and I still glory, in the belief that I am, however humble and unworthy, an *evangelical* preacher. And by the grace of God, no man shall rob me of this glorying. For, even if it be esteemed "the foolishness of vain boasting," I am willing to "be accounted as a fool for Christ's sake." I use the term evangelical not with a party meaning, or in an invidious sense. Not as it is assumed by some who ring the changes upon a few favorite doctrines and cant phrases, while they overlook and neglect, as unimportant and carnal, all reference to some of the great principles and precepts of our holy religion, and are entirely indifferent about the constitution and ordinances of the Church of Christ. I use the term as it is commonly received and understood by Christians of intelligence and piety.

But while I claim to be an evangelical teacher, I claim also to be a *sound Churchman*, free from ultraisms and novelties of every sort.

During the whole of my now protracted ministry—from its commencement to the present hour—I have uniformly and unequivocally taught that men "are justified before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for their own works or deservings." During the whole of the same period, however, I have frequently administered the sacraments as "outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace—as means whereby we receive the same, and pledges to

assure us thereof." In the use of the Baptismal Service, I have always considered myself as administering what is called in the Nicene Creed "one baptism for the remission of sins"—and in teaching children the Catechism, I have taught them, in the words of that Scriptural formulary, that "the sacraments are generally necessary to salvation." I cannot now, and I never could, perceive any incongruity between these different branches of Christian teaching; these correlative truths. On the contrary, both of them seem to me essential to the harmony and perfection of the revealed scheme of salvation. God, in his wisdom, has joined them together; and no man has the right to put them asunder. If I am to be condemned for holding these views, I firmly believe that the Evangelists, the Apostles, yea, Christ himself, will be involved in the same condemnation. If for this I must fall, it will be in good company. The Liturgy, the Articles, the Homilies, yea, the Church herself, must fall under the same paricidal blow.

I am, Reverend and Dear Sir,

Yours very affectionately,

J. P. K. HENSHAW.

[LETTER NO. X.]

BRISTOL, Monday, Jan. 25, 1847.

Rt. Rev. J. P. K. Henshaw, D. D.

Dear Sir:—Yours of the 22d instant was received on the evening of the 23d, (Saturday.) Being obliged to return to Bristol for the duties of Sunday, it was sent to me here. From the length of the document, and in view of its subject-matter, it was evident that a reply would be necessary. This I proposed to do briefly, by way of notes subjoined. But, on reflection, I think it would be more respectful to you, and perhaps more just to your statement, to let it stand by itself, and reply to it by a formal communication. This is my present purpose.

On a careful analysis, I find that it may be divided into three parts; one, embracing the points at issue between us; and the others, relating to incidental matters, and personal considerations. With respect to the essential points at issue, I propose to answer them in full. Providentially, I am able to show that none of the supposed inconsistencies exist; consequently that, the inferences drawn from them are unfounded. Further; I shall be able to vindicate my statement, in the two or three points only in which it is assailed, by facts and explanations, which cannot leave a doubt of its correctness.

With regard to the other parts of your letter, embracing the first four and last eight pages of manuscript, relating to incidental points, and personal considerations, I should prefer to

leave them unnoticed. But, as you have introduced them, it will be more becoming in me to give them respectful attention.

FIRST—INCIDENTAL POINTS.

1. You speak of the interview had with myself, and Brother, on the 8th.

I would add to the statement there made that, I remarked; "my own judgment is in accordance with the opinions of my friends." You also stated in answer to my remark, how "extensively wrong impressions prevailed on this subject"; that, you "had heard very few speak of it." I added that, "it was a general topic of remark, and that I believed it necessary that all the facts should be known."

2. You allude to "the injury done to religion by disputes among Christians."

These disputes have wrought injury chiefly, when they have been conducted in an improper spirit. Christian feeling is not inconsistent with the maintenance of what one believes to be vital truth.

3. You speak of the "impropriety of making the public a court of appeal, in reference to points of doctrine and discipline in the Church."

I cannot admit the justness of this remark in its application to the *Christian* public. I think that, the *Laity* should be kept enlightened on all matters of importance in the Church. They are represented in her councils—they assist in framing her laws—they are the supporters of her institutions—and without them, we can do nothing. I view with alarm a growing disposition, in some portions of the Church, to check the influence of the Laity. They have a right to be informed of all things relating to "doctrine and to discipline." Deprive them of this right, and we take away one of the best safeguards for the truth. Bishop Griswold is reported to have said that, "the hope of the Church is in the Laity." Indeed, the Christian Laity are recognised as a "court of appeal," by an Apostle. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; *because many false prophets are gone out into the world.*" *St. Basil* teaches: "Hearers, instructed in the Scriptures, *ought to try the things spoken by their teachers*, and receive those doctrines which are consonant, and reject those which are alien, from the Holy Scriptures, because *St. Paul* saith, 'Try all things,' &c." On this passage from *St. Paul*, *Whitby* says: "Note that the Apostle doth not here bid the Guides (ministers) of the Church, to try all things, and the people hold fast that which *they* delivered to them; but gives an injunction common to all Christians, 'having their senses exercised to discern good

and evil'; to all who are obliged to hold fast that which is good, and not to believe false prophets." *Whitby* further says of the duty of the *layman*; "till he hath made this trial, he must not admit the doctrine as an article of Christian faith; for these words plainly teach that, *what we must hold fast, must first be tried.*"

I cannot, therefore, admit the "impropriety of making the [Christian] public a court of appeal, in reference to points of doctrine or discipline in the Church."

4. You speak of the "disgrace brought upon the Church by the controversies which have taken place in some other Dioceses," and of "the fearful evils that would follow a publication which would probably provoke a reply," &c.

I am not prepared to admit that, many of the controversies which have taken place in other Dioceses, painful as they have been in many respects, will not result in good. The sin has been, not so much in the fact of controversy, as in the spirit which some of the parties have manifested. But, the same may be said of the Reformation, when all was controversy in the Church. The evil we condemn, the good we praise—the resulting benefits are to the glory of God. Paul himself was continually engaged in controversy, but he forgot not the spirit of his Master. Even personal disputes he did not always avoid, for "he withstood Peter to his face because he was to be blamed." His rule is: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." If we are exhorted to "follow peace with all men," it is also enjoined that we should "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." The effectual weapon in this warfare, is the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." In such a controversy, in contending for the doctrines of the Reformation, Bishop Griswold was engaged, at the time of his death. There must be controversy. To yield it, is to give up the truth. "The enemy will come in like a flood," if, in the strength which the Spirit gives, we fight not under the "standard" which "the Lord shall lift up against him." Nor can controversy be limited to the world without, or to heretical branches of the Church. [Acts xx. 30. 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. 2 Pet. ii. 1, &c. &c.] I have just seen a published letter of Bishop Doane, in which he says, "the great want of the Church at this time is rest and quiet"; but, surely not at the expense of truth—Bishop Doane himself being judge—for he elsewhere says: "*To those who shrink from controversial topics, and would shun all controversy, let it be said, in parting, it is not given to man. We hold the truth only by dint of never-flinching firmness. The price of religious, not less than civil, freedom, is perpetual vigilance.*" Bishop Lee, in his late charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Delaware, remarks, in relation to the present con-

troversies of the Church: "While the lover of peace laments the disquiet and bitterness which are too often engendered by such differences, we may hope that the issue may be, by no means unmixed evil. When Christian doctrines are deeply seated in the heart, they cannot be easily and tamely surrendered. Whenever and wherever truth has been assailed, if really loved and prized, it has been the occasion of earnest struggle. *Among the salutary effects of such seasons, is the fuller examination of the points brought into question, and the holding of doctrines which have been canvassed and sifted, with a deeper conviction, and a firmer grasp.* How different, for instance, the esteem in which the doctrine of justification by 'faith only,' was held by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and that manifested by many at the present day, who profess, notwithstanding, to agree with them? What a contrast in the tone of our Articles and Homilies, and other works of that age, upon this point, and that which we now, too often hear. And when doctrines are held in a careless and uninfluential manner, with no adequate understanding of the grounds whereon they rest, or just appreciation of their value, they are easily parted with upon the assault of error, or retained only in form and name, while their life and reality are unknown."

Let us hope, then, that the present controversy may result in good. If it shall tend to draw the attention of the Church in this Diocese more to the nature of the doctrine of justification by faith alone; if it shall lead to a clearer apprehension of the question, whether or not, the penitent sinner is completely justified in the sight of God, before Baptism; if it shall induce the canvassing and sifting of Baptism itself; of the relation it sustains to the inward grace which it signifies; and of the nature of the benefits it confers; so that there may be less confusion of ideas on this subject; if, above all, it shall bring our younger Clergy, and our candidates for orders, to investigate more fully the Scriptural doctrine, and the Church's teaching: then, surely, we may hope that, with something of evil, growing out of this controversy, there may also be, something of good.

In regard to lesser matters, I will admit the inexpediency of controversy in the Church. I will not, therefore, as I remarked to you in my first communication, quarrel with a man about his churchmanship. He may be as high as the highest; (and perhaps, on questions relating to the Ministry, &c. I might not differ from him;) if he will only preach the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and win souls to Christ, I say "*God speed him in his work.*" Now, Rt. Rev. and Dear Sir, it is one of these fundamental doctrines, which is the subject of our present controversy. On no other ground did I find any difficulty with

———. His high churchmanship—his exclusive views—on

none of these did I make issue. I remarked that, *I was satisfied with him*; and I should have presented him for orders, had not the Rev. Mr. Horton, (who had been silent during most of the examination,) in reply to your inquiry, "Are there any more questions to be asked?" said, "I should like to ask one question"; whereupon, he addressed to the candidates an inquiry respecting "justification by faith," which elicited an answer from ——. This answer, I thought ambiguous. It awakened my attention—and, as in duty bound, I pressed the examination on this point, till I was convinced of his unsoundness. It is thus evident that, I was not seeking *occasion* for difference, and did not anticipate it. The most kindly feelings existed among all the parties, and nothing but this discovery of ———'s unsoundness, (in my opinion,) in fundamentals, caused the difficulty. As farther evidence of my sincerity in declaring that, in reference to points not fundamental, I would not make issue, I would remind you that, at the examination of candidates for Deacon's orders, on the day following, Mr. ———, (a stranger to me,) proved himself a thorough High Churchman; and I presented him for orders on the very day of ———'s ordination.

5. You state that, the difference between ——— and myself, does "not affect the vitals of Christianity"; a declaration which, in substance, you have several times repeated.

This I regret for many reasons. It makes an issue with my Bishop with respect to doctrine, whereas *I only intended to make such issue with the candidate*. But I cannot help it. It is a position into which I am forced—not one which I have chosen. It might, indeed, have seemed more modest, to have mistrusted my own judgment; but, in essential principles of truth, I cannot defer, even to my Bishop. Besides, I am well aware that a noble army of martyrs—a blessed band of confessors—and many chief pastors both at home and abroad—take the same view of Justification, for which I am now involved in this controversy. The excellent Bishop of Winchester said, in reference to the doctrine of justification by faith alone; "there is reason to fear that, the distinctive principles of our Church would be endangered, if men should envelope in a *cloud* the great doctrine which sets forth the way in which we are accounted righteous before God." Speaking of the Oxford theology, Bishop McIlvaine says: "Nothing could more plainly, or more impressively, display the great gulf fixed between this divinity and that of the Scriptures, than simply this—that, while the evidence of justification which the Scriptures refer to continually, is that of faith, and *never to our having been baptized*," &c. Again: "If Cranmer did hold literally and strictly, that justification cannot take place until we are baptized, how is it that he

writes the Homily on Justification—and yet, baptism, as *having any such relation*, is not hinted at?" Again: "In the Homilies justification is *expressly limited to faith, as its only instrument of reception*." Again: "The Article of Justification contains not one word about baptism. The only instrument it knows is faith." Once more, Bishop McIlvaine remarks: "We positively assert that it is the doctrine of our Church, that whenever a sinner *repents and believes* in the Lord Jesus Christ; *before* baptism, *at* baptism, or *after* baptism, his sins are perfectly and freely remitted—he is freely and *completely* justified, through the righteousness of God by faith."

It appears, then, that I am in good company when I consider the difference between ——— and myself, *fundamental*.

6. You refer twice to your proposal to submit the case to the "umpireship of six senior Presbyters," &c.

In my note of the 22d I stated briefly, why I was obliged to reject this proposition. I will now add that, the only one of the gentlemen named by you, whom I have seen, agreed with me at once as to the inexpediency of such a course. He would not have been found willing to have acted in the case. I am more and more convinced that, it would have resulted in involving others in the difficulty—rendering your situation more unpleasant—and ending in a way most unsatisfactory. Upon what was this Council to decide? Not upon the settlement of any personal difficulty, for none such existed. There were no hostile feelings to be reconciled—no animosities to be allayed. They could sit only in judgment on points of doctrine; and on these, I *know* there is a difference among them respecting the question involved, that would render an united decision impracticable. One of these gentlemen was the Presenter of Mr. ———; and another has declared that, had he been in my place, he would have "felt bound to *protest* against the Ordination." What, then, would have been the result? But, even supposing that these difficulties did not exist, the decision of a Council could not change my views of Gospel truth, or of personal duty. In such a case as this, to our own Master we must stand or fall.

7. You state that upon me must rest the "responsibility of this publication."

It is true that, I assume this responsibility, (with your permission as to your own letters,) with this exception; that, I am not willing to be held responsible for the effect which the altered tone of your last communication may produce. As this letter was written with a view to publication, the responsibility is not mine.

8. You say that, "rumors reached me that you would yield to the solicitations of some of your friends, by abandoning the idea of publication."

I can only say that, these rumors had no foundation, except so far as they might refer to printing rather than publishing. In the two instances in which such solicitation was made, I found that the case was not understood.

SECOND—ESSENTIAL POINTS AT ISSUE.

These are Four in number. I propose to take them up in order.

1. You state: "In your second letter to me, under head of *Objection 2*, you seem to imply that my *impression* that your only desire was to be relieved from a specific part in the ordination, was founded rather on my own inference from what you said, than on any distinct declaration of yours."

I do *not* mean to imply this respecting your "*impression*." In fact, my design in these remarks was to show that, you had this "*impression*," from what I said—but that I did not state in words "*my only desire is*." All that I objected to under that head is the use of the qualifying word "*only*" in that connection. In other words, I do not object to the fact you state that your "*impression*," gathered from what I said, was, that my "*only desire was to be relieved from this specific part*," &c. ; but I do object to the implication that I used these words in this connection, "*my only desire is*," &c. If, indeed, you say that I used these very words, then I shall not deny it, for I will not be found at issue with my Bishop when he states positively that he recollects a fact. I understand you to state, however, not the very words, but the substance of what I said, from which I am very willing to concede you gathered the "*impression*" that my "*only desire was*," &c. The other expressions you mention, viz. : that I "*would make no opposition to the ordination, and had no desire to throw any obstacle in the way of it*," *are, word for word, what I did say*. By these I meant the same as if I had said, "*I will not object—I will not protest*—(which words I used several times)—*I will not insist that he must not be ordained*. If my own conscience is relieved, I shall not stand in the way of others doing what they see fit. I will place no obstacle in the way—I have no such desire." This is all I did mean, or could mean. My only desire was to relieve myself of all responsibility—and so I thought I was understood. There is not, then, as you suppose in this case, any distrust of your "*veracity*" or your "*memory*." With respect to the entry in your journal, I have no objection to make to it. *It is not inconsistent with any thing I have said*. With respect to the "*words*" used in the ordinal, I repeat what I said in my second letter, under the head of *Objection 2d* ; "*I do not remember that*

the 'words' prescribed in the ordinal to be used by the presenting Presbyter, were made the subject of remark between us. They were in the private interview with ———. When he pressed me on the subject, I declared to him frankly, (referring to the words,) that I could not say them in the fear of God. But even if I had laid stress upon the "words," in my conversation with you, my "scruples" were based on *general principles fully expressed*, which would necessarily prevent *any direct agency* in promoting the ordination. Now an *action* may speak as loudly as *words*. The "words" embodied an idea to which I could not assent; and I should have been singularly inconsistent if I could be willing to perform an act, involving, substantially, the same declaration before God and the congregation."

There is, then, here, no issue of *fact* between us.

2. Under the head No. 2, in your comments on my remarks in my second letter, under *Objection 4*, you think I have been inconsistent in drawing an inference that two Presbyters would be present, besides myself, because you had said in the morning that Bro. "Horton must be present."

Now, as truth is always consistent with itself, so it is in the present instance. All your remarks under this head, (I say it respectfully,) lose their force entirely in the light of facts. *Nor do I join issue with my Bishop as to one of the facts he states.* I am perfectly willing to admit every one. In order, however, to give full prominence to your objection, I will quote it. After stating the circumstances under which you made the remark, Bro. "Horton must be present," you conclude: "How you could connect this circumstance with the expectation of Mr. Hathaway's coming, I cannot conjecture. For, so far as I am informed, nothing was said of sending for Mr. H. until the afternoon of Saturday."

You are correct in this impression. I did not know that Bro. H. was to be sent for, till I learned the fact from ——— at your dinner table on Saturday afternoon. But I did know it was settled that some Presbyter should be provided, and that he with Bro. Horton would count two. When, therefore, I was assured that Bro. Hathaway would be sent for, then "I felt perfectly at ease." By reference to the remarks in my second letter under *Objection 4*, you will see that this is *what I state*. The subject is also mentioned in the same letter under *Objection 2*, where I say: "When, as I supposed, every thing had been arranged, Bro. Hathaway being sent for, who, with Bro. Horton, would make the number of *two Presbyters beside myself*, and thus obviate any *necessity* of my taking an active part in the ordination service; still, to avoid all misunderstanding," (which was my only motive in addressing you the question,) "I said to you on *Saturday afternoon*, as I parted from

you, 'Bishop, what will be expected of me?' You replied, 'Simply to present the Deacons';—with this I was satisfied." What inconsistency is there in all this? Was it not a *fact* on Saturday morning that Bro. Horton was expected to be present? You admit it. Was it not a fact on Saturday noon, when it was determined to send for Bro. Hathaway, that Bro. Horton was still expected to be present? It is not denied. Was not the expectation of Bro. Horton's presence still a fact, when I parted from you on Saturday afternoon? There is no doubt of it. Was it not still a fact till a late hour on Saturday evening, when ——— returned from Warren, and for the first time disclosed the necessity of Bro. Horton's absence? I am thus assured by the Rev. Mr. Horton. Was any communication made to me on this subject? There was none. Was I informed of it on Sunday morning, before the ordination? I was not. Is not, then, the fact upon which my vindication rests, clear as the noonday sun?

3. Under the head No. 3, your remarks, (implying something more than mere inconsistency on my part,) are evidently founded on the supposition that, I could not honestly have expected Bro. Horton's presence at the ordination.

The explanation which I have given above, is sufficient also here. But I will notice the prominent particulars under this head.

You state: "You have long ere this, I presume, been convinced, that no one else of the parties concerned, neither the candidates for ordination, Mr. Hathaway, nor myself, had the slightest expectation that any third Presbyterian would make his appearance."

I would ask, respectfully, whether it is hardly fair for my Bishop to address this question, involving me in an apparent dilemma, when he knew the reasons why the Bishop, "the candidates," and the "Rev. Mr. Hathaway" did not expect a "third Presbyterian." That reason is given above. The arrangement with Mr. Horton to be absent, made at nine o'clock on Saturday evening, *was known to them*, but not to me. I learned it incidentally since my first two letters were written, or it would have been mentioned in them. I am truly thankful that a fact so important, has come to my knowledge, in season for my complete vindication.

But you proceed to say: "How naturally might it have been expected that a man who had been laboring under such anxiety of mind, and had been grievously disappointed by the non-arrival of confidently expected relief, would speak of his disappointment and express his regret, so soon as he had an opportunity of unbosoming himself to those who had been grieved and wounded by his conduct," &c. &c. "Did you, my Rev. friend and

Brother, make any such avowal to the Bishop or clergy after that mournful occurrence?" &c.

I reply, (1.) That I did speak with —— himself to this effect. He took me aside and said: "Mr. Cooke, I wish you to do me a favor." I replied: "Bro. ——, there is no one for whom I would more cheerfully take pains to do a personal favor, than yourself, under present circumstances. I regret exceedingly to have wounded your feelings, but it has been with me a case of conscience." I do not remember that he replied to this remark: but he continued: "Bro. Horton wishes you to preach for him at St. Andrew's, and let Mr. K. (who was to have preached at St. Andrew's) preach for Dr. Crocker." "But where is Bro. Horton?" I replied. "*Why is he not here?*" Then —— informed me *for the first time* that Bro. Horton had gone to Warren; and when I pressed the reason for it, said, that "in view of the peculiar relations Bro. H. sustains to Dr. Crocker and his congregation, it was not thought best that he should be involved, (or he did not think best to be involved, I will not be certain which was the expression;) in this difficulty." I replied, "Bro. Horton thinks with me on this subject." "*I know he does,*" said —— . Other remarks were made, respecting the particular sermon which Bro. H. wished me to preach, &c., which are unimportant. Bro. —— must not blame me for repeating this private conversation, which has the aspect of being almost confidential, for your remarks and appeal have made it necessary.

(2.) During the short time I was with you in the chancel, we were occupied in disposing of the sacramental bread which remained. My attention was soon called by some friends in the Church, by whom I was detained a few minutes. I also had the interview spoken of above with —— . After entering the vestry-room, I left almost immediately, as I was obliged to go a great distance, to obtain a sermon to preach at St. Andrew's; (an arrangement for which I had not been prepared;) and I had been pressed to leave by Bro. Hathaway, who was overtaken by me in Broad street. The other clergy were present in the vestry-room—neither they nor my Bishop *said a word on the subject*; and surely, it is not strange that, in the hurry and confusion of these few moments, I said nothing. It was not a time for me to confer with you.

(3.) Had I spoken to you at *that time*, it would have been, probably, in the language of respectful complaint. My feelings were conflicting—but *I felt that I was the aggrieved party*.

(4.) As I walked down Broad street, with Bro. Hathaway, I expressed to him my *great surprise* that the Bishop should place me in that embarrassing situation, after the decided declarations I had made respecting the unsoundness of ——, and I also

expressed my deep regret at what had occurred.* He replied : "It must have been unpleasant." Other conversation ensued, which it is not necessary to mention.

(5.) On my way, I stopped at the Rev. Dr. Crocker's—told him of what had occurred—and made the *same complaint* I had to Bro. Hathaway.

I returned to my parish on Monday evening. On Tuesday, I wrote my first letter to you, which was a transcript of my feelings at the time. In this I express the same feeling of surprise : "What shall I say of my feelings when you signified your desire that I should lay hands on ——— ? *How could I do it ? How could my Bishop expect me to do it, after what had passed ?*" In this letter, I endeavored to be frank, candid, respectful, and affectionate, even as I felt. On perusing it again, I see nothing to the contrary.

Thus the inferences you have drawn under head No. 3, concluding with the declaration, "here is something in relation to human feeling, and human action, too deep for my philosophy to fathom," are answered by the facts.

4. Your remarks under the fourth head, relate chiefly to qualifications to your former declaration : "*I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination.*"

(1.) You say, "when these words were written, I had seen only your first letter, and of course they can legitimately be applied to that only."

Very true. Who could suppose otherwise ? How could I suppose that the reader would apply them to the very document I was then in the act of writing when I quoted them, and which of course you had not seen.

(2.) You seem to be unwilling that I should make "any use" of your declaration, "so as to sanction" my "statements," even in the document to which you applied it. The reason you give is that, "*it was written without a spirit of discussion, and without any view to publication, but in the frankness of fraternal confidence.*"

Surely, I am bound to believe that my Bishop speaks truly, though it be "without a view to publication," and in "fraternal confidence"—that he means just what he says—that, when he declares respecting my first letter, "I have no fault to find with the general accuracy of your report of the examination," he means this and nothing more nor less. Of course, I

* I have inquired of the Rev. Mr. H. respecting *his* recollection of the conversation. He states : "You expressed your regret that the Bishop should have placed you in so embarrassing a situation."

am bound to believe from what you say that, you would not have made the admission, with a view to publication; but, I am also bound to believe that you made it in *private* because it was *true*. If it would have been unwise to have admitted it in public, it is not, on that account, less true.

(3.) But, to do away with its legitimate force on the mind of the reader, you say: "May not a statement be correct in every important particular, and nevertheless be defective in some minor particulars, a correct understanding of which, in all their relations and connections, would throw a new light over the whole matter, and give it an entirely different aspect? May not a statement be generally correct as to leading facts, and yet be so circumstantially erroneous, so mixed up with special pleadings to make out a case, so ingeniously and skilfully arranged as to the collocation of particulars, that, upon the whole, it constitutes a gloss and commentary, rather than a history, and presents to the reader's mind a prejudiced and distorted view of the real merits of the case? Such things are not uncommon in the history of human controversies, or even in that of human jurisprudence."

This, I suppose, is meant particularly for the eye of the reader. There is nothing like it—no hint of it in your private communications to me. In what light, then, am I to regard it? You do not assert this of my statement—you put it all interrogatively, and in an abstract form. But what is its meaning? If it means any thing, in the connection in which you have placed it, it means that it is *all true of my statement*. It is evidently intended to have this effect on the mind of the reader. But you do not take the responsibility of saying that it is so; and should I call upon you to substantiate this, you could reply: "I have made no such assertion—I have only shown how a statement may be accurate in generals, and yet defective in particulars—so that it is not right to infer from my declaration, that I necessarily approve of all parts of your statement." But *the reader will draw a very different inference*; and I am bound to consider it in the sense in which it will be taken. I hope, therefore, I shall not seem disrespectful, if, through you, I request the reader's attention to certain particulars.

1. Let him look at the statement, sift it, analyze it, and see if it bears not on its face the evidence of truth.

2. I solemnly declare it to be a true and fair statement; not, in any respect, either by "omissions," "collocation of particulars," or in *any other way*, intended to mislead—that it was my intention, and conscientious endeavor, to do *justice to all the parties concerned*; and now, on a review of the whole, I declare

it to be a fair, impartial, and true statement.* If it were not so, why is it not shown wherein?

3. Let him mark the manner in which you speak of it to me in "fraternal confidence" as a *report of the examination generally accurate*.

4. Let him observe that you make *one exception*, where you add: "Still I think it would have been more accurate if you had stated," &c. By making this exception and *none other*, is it not perfectly evident that to the Bishop's mind, no other correction was needed? *Is not the evidence of this even stronger than if no exception had been taken?* Does it not show that even in this letter, "written in fraternal confidence," there was no disposition on the part of the Bishop to overlook what he considered an important omission? In view of this fact, is it possible that there could have been an "omission of particulars which would throw a new light over the whole matter, and give it an entirely different aspect," without its being remarked upon by the Bishop; especially as he occupied nearly twelve manuscript pages in reply, and had the whole subject before him *several days before the date of that reply*? If there were in it "special pleadings to make out a case, so ingeniously and skillfully arranged as to the collocation of particulars, that, upon the whole, it constitutes a gloss and commentary rather than a history, and gives a prejudiced and distorted idea of the real merits of the case," is it reasonable that, in his reply, the Bishop should have assented to the correctness of the report of the examination?

5. The spirit of the whole reply, under date of the 28th ultimo, is in accordance with the declaration, "I have no fault to find," &c.

You speak of the "spirit of frankness," evinced by me, in my inquiries, and say in conclusion—"However much you have erred in this matter, *I do not at all question* that you conscientiously believed yourself to be right." "I shall *no less cordially than ever*, be willing to co-operate with you," &c.

* The only qualification which I would make to this declaration is, a doubt whether the word "simply" was used in the connection in which it stands in my first letter. You do not object to it, but I am bound, in candor, to express the doubt. Whether you said "*simply* to present the Deacons," or "*only*" to present, &c., or "*just*" to present, &c., or conveyed the impression distinctly by your manner, I cannot, on reflection, be certain. But that you did use the words, "to present the Deacons," in reply to my inquiry as to "what would be expected of *me*," an inquiry addressed to you at the last interview on Saturday afternoon preceding the ordination, solely for the purpose of leaving no room for misunderstanding, is certain. I received the impression as distinctly as I could wish. As to the particular word used, as above indicated, I cannot be certain. "Simply," expresses the impression received as well as any other.

May I be permitted to ask, could my Bishop have thus felt, and thus written, when he received this statement, had he considered it a "gloss and commentary rather than a history," giving a "distorted view of the real merits of the case, &c. Would he not rather have rebuked with honest indignation, and either have refused to answer the letter, or else have exposed its deceit? But, instead of this, he assures me that, he will answer my inquiries "*in the same spirit of frankness* with which they are proposed." Now these very inquiries, to which allusion is thus made, are predicated on the previous statement as a *fair and true statement of facts*. They are thus introduced. "Such, my dear Bishop, are the facts. *I remind you of them for my justification*. Not having conversed with you since the ordination, I know not what your feelings are on this subject; but tell me wherein I have erred, if I have incurred your displeasure? With my views of truth and duty, how could I do otherwise? What on this subject did I leave unsaid or undone, that I ought to have said or done?"

6. At the interview held on the 8th instant, in the presence of a third party, among the various reasons you assigned for not publishing, you did not hint that you had any fault to find with my statement, nor did you *object* to the publication of your letter on the ground that it contained anything written in "fraternal confidence," and "without a view to publication." You deprecated publishing, but if my statement should be published, you declared distinctly that *you had no objection that your reply should be also published*. Nor did you intimate a wish to qualify anything it contained. When asked if you had anything to add, you replied in the negative. If, therefore, your letter was written in "fraternal confidence," and "without a view to publication," you assented to its publication with the distinct declaration that you *had nothing to add to it*. It is true you had not then seen my reply—but I would respectfully submit that, at the time, you had no thought of qualifying anything that document contained.

7. A disinterested witness, the Rev. S. J. Horton, after an attentive perusal of the document, has, (as I have elsewhere stated,) pronounced it a fair and honest statement.

THIRD—PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Your remarks, involving personal considerations, are embraced in the last eight manuscript pages. I have no issue to make on grounds like these. Far be it from me to detract any thing from the reputation you have earned in the Church of God. I question neither the facts, nor the inferences you have drawn from your personal history. The bare idea of a design to injure you by misrepresentation, is as foreign to my desire, as it is to fact. There is nothing like it in the documents which I

have submitted to you—there is nothing like it in the hidden recesses of my heart. I have stated facts—only facts—facts not distorted—not misrepresented—not so placed as knowingly to carry any other meaning than what plainly belongs to them, and what appears on the face of them. *I have not put words into the mouth of my Bishop which he did not use.* If I have unwittingly done so; if in any instance there is unintentional misrepresentation or omission, most cheerfully would I make the correction—but none such have been pointed out by my Bishop; of none such am I now aware.

I am indeed conscious that, the facts I have stated, may produce impressions respecting your views of the Sacraments, which I had hoped that your explanations might remove, if unfounded. In the document itself, I say—“ I confess, too, in the same spirit of frankness that, the reasoning and illustrations used in the argument that followed, surprised me. Some of these seemed to me to lead logically, to conclusions which *I could not suppose would be assented to by my Bishop.* As I remarked to ———, at the private interview on Saturday, when he insisted that you agreed with him, “ far be it from me to catechise my Bishop. It would be presumption in me to discuss that point at all—with that I can have nothing to do :” so now, I repeat most respectfully that, if in the statements which follow, I seem to be placed in an antagonistic position with my Bishop on points of doctrine, it is owing to the force of circumstances, and not to any choice or consent of mine. It is therefore a source of regret and concern that, instead of meeting the one question presented at the examination as the ground of difference, and which might be disposed of affirmatively or negatively in a single sentence, you have not expressed your opinion upon it. But it does not become me to say more on this point. Providentially, however, I have satisfactory evidence, (if such is needed,) to show my indisposition to produce “ distrust ” of my Bishop. Important as the facts stated in my third letter are to a just appreciation, by the Christian public, of my true position, it *was not my intention to publish that portion of it which contains the details of the examination, &c.,* unless it should be rendered necessary by some subsequent publication. I so stated to the few friends to whom I read it. My only reason was, my dislike to bring before the public things, which, I felt, would be personally disagreeable to yourself—especially as I knew your words and arguments were not so carefully guarded, as if they had been intended for the public eye or ear. The printer was accordingly furnished with *only an extract* from this letter, which will be found enclosed in brackets, in the published document.* Of this extract, I informed you of my note of 21st instant. All

* Pages 35, 37.

that portion which might prove particularly unpleasant to you—all the facts of the examination, &c., are *omitted*. The “extract” was inserted because, otherwise, I should appear to the reader to omit all notice of your reply relating to ———’s orthodoxy. It was thus introduced, as I copy it from the *printer’s proof* which is before me. “For various reasons I do not think it necessary or expedient to publish this “review” in my vindication. For this purpose my statement and reply to the Bishop’s letter are deemed sufficient. But, lest I should seem to omit any portion of the Bishop’s letter which required notice, I would call the particular attention of the reader to the following extract from that communication.” Here, then, is evidence not to be mistaken, of my original design, not to publish the greater part of this important document, in the present pamphlet. You were informed of the “extract,” but you have omitted all notice of it, and in a letter intended for publication, have replied to the communication as a whole. Of course, then, the whole must be published that the reader may judge for himself. And here, indeed, if I were disposed by “special pleading” to “make out a case,” I might leave this part of the subject. I am bound, however, in candor, to state that, in view of all the circumstances—particularly the contingency of a publication by ———, which might contain statements rendering the publication of the whole necessary; and the expediency of having the whole case presented to the reader at a glance; I had concluded to print the document entire, and should have informed you of it. The only benefit, therefore, I can derive from the fact just stated is, to show my indisposition, unnecessarily, to bring before the public, a document unpleasant to my Bishop. Now, however, the necessity of its publication is rendered absolute.

On reviewing my third letter, I find one fact, which though it must be perfectly understood by yourself, may not be by all who read this correspondence.* I allude to the reference made to the case of the Rev. Mr. ———.

At a Convocation held at St. Michael’s Church, Bristol, three years since, the Rev. Mr. ———, in addressing the teachers of my Sunday School, assembled in the presence of the Bishop, the clergy, and a large congregation, based his remarks upon the idea that saving grace had necessarily been implanted in the hearts of the children when they were baptized—that it was the duty of the teacher to cultivate this grace—that it was their duty not so much to *impart* spiritual knowledge, as it was to *develop* the grace in them, &c. While he was speaking, my own duty was made plain. I did not so understand the Gospel. My predecessors in that parish, including the lamented Bishop Griswold, did not so preach the Gospel. I could not, therefore, hesitate.

* The reader will find this fact stated on page 31.

When the Rev. Mr. ——— had concluded, I followed, and, avoiding as much as possible, the appearance of a formal answer to what had been said, I endeavored to give my views of the gospel plan of salvation. I drew also an analogy between circumcision and baptism, in relation to the spiritual meaning and benefits of both ordinances; and showed that they were seals of the righteousness of faith, which was experienced independent of the external ordinance.

For this, my testimony to what I believed the truth, I received the thanks of the Rev. Dr. Crocker, and others of the clergy, and subsequently, a like testimony from numerous individuals of my congregation. But my Bishop said that he "much regretted what had occurred, and in his opinion the difference between ——— and myself, *was not fundamental, but rather a difference in the use of terms*." Dr. Crocker, however, remarked to the Rev. Mr. ———, that if this is truth, he (Dr. C.,) had "been preaching error for forty years;" and it was characterised by the Rev. J. Bristed, in the hearing of yourself and others, as being "the very quintessence of Puseyism." (I have his permission to repeat his words.) You interposed and begged that the discussion might be dropped. Such are the facts of this case. It was not done in a corner, and has been often made the subject of remark by clergymen and laymen. My object in introducing this at the examination was, to *justify me in dissenting from your remark that the difference between ——— and myself was not fundamental*; particularly as the subsequent course of the Rev. Mr. ——— had justified all that I had said on that occasion.

And now, Rt. Rev. and Dear Sir, what shall I say in reply to your pointed queries, and the *hypothetical* remarks which follow in relation to my *motives*? Shall I express the emotions which I experienced on their first perusal? This would not be respectful to my Bishop, nor in accordance with my present feelings, with which are mingled nothing, I trust, unbecoming a Christian, who is conscious of having been strangely misunderstood. Is it possible that my Bishop could suppose me such an one as his remarks imply? Is there any thing in my past history—any thing in our personal intercourse—anything in the progress of the "examination"—anything in my letters on the face of them—that can justify the suspicion that, instead of being frank and open, I am one to make "*dark hints and intimations*," which would not bear exposure in the light of conscience, and before the mercy seat of God? What possible motive could move me to a purpose so despicable and wicked? What, indeed, have I "*to gain*" by such a course? By your own admission, I have been one of your "most beloved and respected Presbyters;"—You "have never studied any concealment from, or practised any disguise with me;"—You have been "as free in all (your) communications with (me) as with any of

(your) Presbyters ;"—You have " manifested (your) fraternal confidence and regard in selecting (me) to be an examiner and presenter in an ordination, when (your) own son was one of the candidates." We had just returned from a pleasant convocational season in one of our newly formed parishes, where we had preached together—prayed together—and counselled together—with not a breath of discord to mar the Christian harmony. In the same spirit—without one thought of evil—without one suspicion of what was to follow—I cheerfully consented to prolong my absence from my parish, and family, and various engagements, to meet your wishes. In the same spirit of Christian harmony we met at the examination—in the same spirit it was conducted—in the same spirit it was continued by all parties, even through the discussion which disclosed to me the unsoundness of our friend ———, and the impossibility of my fulfilling any expectation of presenting him for Priest's orders. I was frank—open—explicit—in all that I said. I did not wish to interpose any obstacle to his ordination, *should the Bishop determine to proceed without my agency*. I might have objected, or protested—(perhaps I ought,) but, I did not. I felt for ———. He was a friend. I had examined him and approved him for Deacon's orders a year before ; as a member of the Standing Committee, I had just approved him as " a person worthy to be admitted to the sacred order of Priests ;" and the *temptation was strong* to overlook his error. But I could not do it. Conscience would not permit. My obligations to the Church would not permit. My responsibility as examining Presbyter would not permit. My accountability at the judgment would not permit. I did not, therefore, hesitate to declare distinctly *my belief* that ——— was unsound in a vital point. Anxious and troubled because my Bishop and my friend were anxious and troubled, I retired to rest with an aching head and sorrowful heart. The events of Sunday followed. Then came the correspondence—frank—straight forward—stating facts—giving my own impressions—nothing less and nothing more. This is my vindication—this the answer I must make to my Bishop in view of all the questions, whether positive or hypothetical, which he has addressed to me. If it be not enough, my vindication must be deferred to a tribunal at which no finite judge shall appear.

Very respectfully, your Presbyter,

JAS. W. COOKE.

In concluding this statement, I would remark that, I have no sympathy with any, (if such there be in the Church,) who, in the language of the Bishop, " ring the changes upon a few favorite doctrines, while they overlook and neglect as unimportant and carnal, all reference to some of the great principles and pre-

cepts of our holy religion, and are entirely indifferent about the constitution and ordinances of the Church of Christ." I believe that *all* of Scripture truth—whether relating to doctrines or duties—should be presented in its proper connection and due proportions. I may appeal to the people of my charge to bear testimony that they have not been left uninstructed in the externals of Christianity, whether relating to the "*Constitution or ordinances of the Church of Christ.*" The following brief extracts from a sermon preached some months since, will show something of the manner in which the obligation and benefits of Baptism are enforced.

"As a Christian, am I to speculate on the question what good can baptism do to a child before it has arrived at years of discretion? Am I to consider the alternative whether it may, or may not be saved, as well out of the ark of Christ's Church as in it? Am I to reason with the elements of mere human wisdom, in things of divine concernment? God forbid. If I would have the *reward* of Noah, let me have the *faith* of Noah. The Lord directs: mine be the duty to obey. He promises: mine be the privilege to believe. He accomplishes: mine be the humility to ascribe all to His power."

"I say not that there is, in the waters of Baptism, any natural fitness to cleanse from sin. I say not that there is, in its administration, any intrinsic efficacy to save the soul. But I do say, in the words of Peter, who, having declared that in the ark of Noah, "few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water," adds; "the like figure whereunto, even Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."

"They (the Sacraments,) 'are not empty signs to them that *believe*, nor effectual causes of grace to them that *believe not.*'"

"Now, brethren, evade not the application by asking, 'how can infants believe—how can they exercise "a good conscience by virtue of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead?" God will take care of this, *if not now, yet in his own time.* We might as well ask, 'how could Abraham's descendants exercise in infancy, the inward faith, of which, St. Paul declares, they received the outward sign and seal?' Or, if it be said again, 'may not God save our children as well out of the Church as in it;' we might ask, with as good reason, 'might not God have saved Noah's family out of the ark, as in it?'"

"In truth, Christian brethren, faith has nothing to do with speculations like these. It lives upon trust. It is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Now, if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it," &c.

"Instead of leaving my children, in the vain language of the world, to choose for themselves, I would choose for them, so far as God may enable me, the better part. I would lay them in the ark of Christ's Church before the deluge of sin shall overwhelm them. I would seek, with their earliest existence, the sacramental pledge of God's covenant grace in their behalf that, they may be, by adoption and visible relations, "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven."





